

the expanded international effort, will bring about the return of the lake trout and other commercial fish to the waters of the Great Lakes.

### Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. A. L. MILLER**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, several of my colleagues have asked why I supported the bill for statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, and why I did not go along with my colleagues from Nebraska on the vote. The reasons are as follows:

First. For 12 years I have been a member of the committee that has had long hearings on the question of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

Second. We have heard more than 700 witnesses, and there has been more than 4,000 pages of testimony covering 57 subjects. Ninety percent of the testimony is favorable to statehood.

Third. The five Gallup polls conducted since 1941 all indicate a heavy percentage favoring statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

Fourth. The poll I conducted in the Fourth Congressional District this last month indicated that 75 percent felt Hawaii and Alaska should have statehood. I doubt it differs much in the other three congressional districts in the State.

Fifth. There have been 35 bills introduced on the question of statehood.

Sixth. There have been five complete investigations by congressional committees on Hawaii, the last committee headed by the late Senator Hugh Butler. The Senator himself strongly recommended statehood.

Seventh. The governors of the 11 Western States at their 1953 convention unanimously approved statehood for Hawaii.

Eighth. Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska has been advocated in the campaign platform of both political parties for many years.

Ninth. The President has recommended statehood for Hawaii and for Alaska if the so-called McKay line would be adopted. The McKay line sets aside about 40 percent of Alaska as a military reservation.

Both Territories, being incorporated, are entitled to statehood. It has been promised to them.

I am certain the question of statehood will be up again and many who have been opposed, if they study all the evidence, will see the justice of admitting Hawaii and Alaska as new States.

### Fishers Island Sound

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. THOMAS J. DODD**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill calling for a full investigation of the problem of protecting the shores of Fishers Island Sound from storm and hurricane tidal floods.

I believe that this proposal can do much to alleviate the great damage, particularly to the eastern Connecticut shoreline, by hurricanes and severe Atlantic storms.

This proposal has already been discussed with the Corps of Army Engineers.

It appears to me to be a practical, efficient, and low-cost method of doing something soon about a grave problem.

This proposal originated with Mr. Henry R. Palmer, Jr., who knows the area in question.

Unless the measures suggested in this bill, or something like them, are undertaken the Government is wasting money on the continual repair and maintenance on breakwaters along this part of our coastline.

I am hopeful that the appropriate committees will give this proposal the most serious consideration.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1955

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Creator and gracious benefactor, in whom we live and move and have our being, inspire us to enter upon each new day with a greater reverence for life and a loftier appreciation of its priceless value and glorious purpose.

Show us how we may carry courageously all those burdens and responsibilities, which at times weigh so heavily upon us, changing them into inspirations and incentives for nobler living.

Grant that the impression and impact which we are consciously or unconsciously making upon the life of our fellow men may always be for good, enabling them to find new springs of joy and new currents of hope.

May we ever live as in Thy sight and for Thy glory and at last save us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tomorrow to file a privileged report on

the District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1956.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana reserved all points of order on the bill.

### GOVERNMENT SALE OF LIQUOR IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to give the District Alcoholic Beverage Control Board the exclusive right to sell whisky at retail in the District.

I have some figures compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress showing that last year there were 16 States operating whisky stores and that the total sales were \$974,186,000. The profits were \$171,260,000.

I also have a letter from the Library of Congress stating that last year in the District retail liquor stores sold approximately \$75 million worth of whisky. These profits run roughly 20 percent of the total sales. If that be true, the District should realize around \$20 million from the sale of whisky in the District. Under present laws the District is receiving \$5,197,000 from licenses and ex-

cise taxes from those stores. So I see a great opportunity for the District to pick up between twelve and fifteen million dollars under this bill.

### AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, I am introducing today a bill to amend paragraph (1) of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act. This bill deals with the long- and short-haul provisions of the act.

I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Chairman Mitchell and the Commission's justification for this bill.

### SAVE 3,500 LIVES YEARLY BY MODERNIZING INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, our death-trap highways are giving and taking an awful beating.

They are the homefront battleline where human beings and motor vehicles are involved in a strange, involuntary war.

Not a day passes without casualties.

Boxcar trucks and high-speed buses and homes on wheels move in and out of the frantic flow, as drivers and pedestrians flirt with constant danger.

Automobile factories are pouring in reinforcements at a record-breaking pace—faster than overloaded highways can take care of them.

No one disputes the fact that we need more and better motor roads.

The only issue is: "How soon we can build them, and how we can pay for them."

We need different highways to serve different purposes—primary, secondary, urban, and interstate.

The States—and through them the communities, and the owners and operators of motor vehicles—are paying a large part of the current burden.

Since 1948, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has committed over half a billion dollars through bond issues and appropriations from the general highway fund for the development of an integrated highway network.

In spite of this great effort, the pressure mounts.

There are more and more cars.

They travel faster and faster on highways that fail to meet the needs of safety, convenience, and economic growth.

The automobiles and its problems are threatening to get out of hand.

We must make a mighty and constructive effort to build modern highways that will promote the free flow of traffic, while safeguarding the lives of drivers and pedestrians.

Interstate highways are the key, and thus become a matter of Federal concern: for safety and ease in travel, for economic development, and for national security.

Highway planners call it force of attraction, which is the economic stimulation of new industrial, commercial, and residential construction within 50 miles of limited access expressways.

This is imperative for older sections of the country, in order to relieve urban congestion, and to accelerate progress in the many communities that are not far from State lines.

How important this is to New England is the fact that the administration's bill is endorsed by the 6 governors of this area, 3 of whom are Republicans and 3 Democrats.

We believe that these States and their motor vehicle taxpayers are carrying more than their share of the load. Any expansion in their highway programs will require major assistance from the Federal Government.

For Massachusetts, the average annual outlay, under the administration bill, including Federal and State contributions, would be \$101 million.

The accent would be on construction of interstate highways.

With the Federal Government contributing 81 million, and the Common-

wealth of Massachusetts providing over \$2 million.

This program would take 10 years to complete, but it would be geared to carry traffic volumes 10 years hence.

In the meantime the State would have the responsibility, on an even matching basis, to build primary, secondary, and urban highways, to tie in with the interstate system.

A pay-as-you-go approach would seriously limit any State's ability to participate in a full-scale and adequate program to solve the steadily worsening highway problem.

The interstate portion of the plan must be financed almost entirely by the Federal Government, and to meet standards established by the Bureau of Public Roads, with maintenance and policing up to the States as part of their share in the cost.

I do not believe that increasing the present heavy taxes on gasoline, and on vehicles, is the best way to provide funds for this program.

The automobile is not simply for the convenience or the service of a minority.

We live in an automotive economy that affects the lives of every single inhabitant of the United States.

That being the case, a bond issue would appear to be the practical and equitable way to finance the highway expansion program, but, whatever formula is finally approved, should reflect the responsibility of all Americans for meeting a national problem.

In considering the issue before us, we must never lose sight of the fact that a first-class nation cannot run the risk of second-class roads.

#### GUILT BY INHERITANCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a resolution which would authorize the Committee on Armed Services to make a thorough investigation of the case of Corp. Walter William Kulich, a member of the United States Army Reserve. I first called this case to the attention of my colleagues in the House on Monday, April 25, under special order.

I pointed out at that time that Corporal Kulich, a 22-year-old youth from Aberdeen, Wash., served 2 years in the United States Army and received an honorable certificate of separation on January 6, 1955, after which he immediately went into the Reserves. About a month later he received a letter from the Army advising him that it had on file allegations that his father was a member of the Communist Party and had attended Communist Party meetings. Corporal Kulich was given the two incredible alternatives of appearing before an Army field board in an attempt to disprove the charges against his father or quietly accepting an undesirable discharge.

Corporal Kulich subsequently was advised by an Army officer designated to assist him that it was up to him to prove his father's innocence of the charges and not up to the Army to prove his father's guilt; that the Army would not disclose to him the names of the witnesses who had supplied the information or the details of the charges; and that about all he could do at the hearing was to bring in witnesses who could testify to his father's good character and testify that his father was not a Communist. The boy knows of nothing on which the charges could be based, and has his father's word that they are not true.

The Army has informed me that it is conducting an investigation of the case. Since I first discussed the case here, the field board hearings originally scheduled for May 3 have been canceled by order of higher headquarters, but I still do not know whether or not the Army will resume its efforts to penalize this young man because of allegations against his father.

Regardless of the outcome of the proceedings against Corporal Kulich, I feel that this case should receive careful and complete investigation by a committee of the House of Representatives, because what has happened to this young man could well be happening to many other young men in our Armed Forces.

I think there is something wrong with a security system which could permit a case to start out the way this case has started out—and, of course, we still do not know how it is going to end.

One particular point I think the congressional investigation should explore is the desirability, the necessity and the constitutionality of imposing the unjust and unwarranted punishment of an undesirable discharge upon a man in Corporal Kulich's position. I seriously wonder whether it is not a violation of constitutional guaranties to draft a man into the service and then subject him to the lifetime handicap of an undesirable discharge because of something his father may have said or done or believed before the son was taken into the service.

Another question the committee should ask and answer to the satisfaction of the American people is whether it is necessary to have a security system which does not turn on the acts of the individual member of the armed services himself, but rather on the acts and associations of other members of his family. In a free America any use of a doctrine of guilt by association is bad enough; guilt by inheritance is even more intolerable.

Since I first called this case to the attention of the House, a number of my colleagues have told me of similar cases which have occurred in their own districts, involving both military personnel and civilian employees of the Government. I am convinced by what I have heard that a number of these cases should be investigated to the end that we may establish a security program which does not do violence to the basic principles of individual liberties and individual rights on which our Nation is founded.



## POLIO VACCINE PROGRAM

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as a physician of many years' experience, I have been concerned about the many vitriolic attacks that have been made on the polio-vaccine program in the past few weeks. It seems to me, sir, that some of these attacks coming from the Democratic side of the House smack strongly of politics. It is unfortunate that anyone would seek political advantage in such a highly sensitive and technical area about a serum which we hope will protect millions of American children. These attacks have raised doubts in the mind of the American public as to the efficiency and competency of our public-health program.

In my opinion, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, has been doing an excellent job in handling this program. She is not a medical scientist. Neither are most of the Members of this House. It is only natural that she should follow the advice and counsel of her technical, scientific advisers. She is doing just that. She should be praised, not derided.

The Public Health Service has called in the finest scientific minds available for consultation on the serum problem. They have taken prompt action to make sure that every batch of polio vaccine is correct and will not bring any tragic results to the American children. Had they taken any other course of action, they would certainly be subject to severe criticism.

The production of polio vaccine is a highly technical and scientific process. It requires numerous complicated tests with mice, rabbits, monkeys, and other animals to insure the efficiency and accuracy of the vaccine. Many people have little knowledge of the subject, and, in speaking on such a question so highly technical and scientific, should remember that "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing." They should not, by all standards of decency, resort in attempting to get political mileage or propaganda at the expense of the health and welfare of the American families.

It is my hope that the days ahead will find fewer of my colleagues, who I am sure have little knowledge about the subject, criticizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and Dr. Scheele, the efficient Director of Public Health, because they are seeking and following the counsel of the best minds available.

There will be other improvements in the polio serum—new discoveries and medicines will come in the future as in the past. They will be used to benefit mankind. The American people can feel content that there does exist a well-organized competent Health Department watching carefully over new products relating to their health. This Congress should praise and not condemn

Mrs. Hobby, the Secretary, or Dr. Scheele, the able, efficient administrator of health matters.

## RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] and many other Members have paid high tribute to the REA, an organization which has, no doubt, meant as much or more than any other to the people in the rural sections of our country. I want to join with them in their praise of this outstanding program.

I fervently hope that the day will never come when this great program will be hampered, slowed down, or retarded in any way. We must continue to expand this great service, which does not cost the Government anything, but which is of such inestimable value not only to our rural areas but to our entire country as well.

When the Federal rural electrification program got under way on May 11, 1935, only 0.9 percent of all Mississippi farms and only 10.9 percent of all United States farms had electricity. Today 74.6 percent of Mississippi farms and 92.3 percent of all United States farms have this service.

Much of the progress recorded in Mississippi and the Nation can be traced directly to the REA program. In Mississippi 187,613 farms are connected to the high line; in the United States 4,965,962 REA borrowers serve about 85 percent of the farms getting service in Mississippi, and about 53 percent of those getting service in the United States.

Up to December 31, 1954, REA had approved a net total of \$88,399,862 in electric loans to 27 borrowers in Mississippi, 26 of them farmer-owned cooperatives. Of this total, \$71,455,957 had been advanced to the borrowers, and they had built 50,190 miles of line. These lines furnished electric power to 214,785 farms and other rural consumers.

Over 8,200 farms and other rural residents of Mississippi will get electric service for the first time as the result of loans approved by the REA in the State during calendar year 1954. Gross loans in the State in that period amounted to \$4,900,000. The loan funds will be used to finance new construction and to make improvements in the electric systems to meet the increasing demand for power by Mississippi farmers and other rural people.

The record of Mississippi borrowers is generally good. The REA debt repayment summary, covering all transactions up to January 1, 1955, shows the borrowers have paid \$5,747,809 in interest and repaid \$11,987,513 of principal on their Government loans. This includes \$2,735,617 on principal paid ahead of sched-

ule which may be applied against future interest and principal installments.

Farmers in this State have increased their average monthly consumption of electricity from 85 kilowatt-hours per farm in 1949 to 143 kilowatt-hours in 1954.

The first REA loan in Mississippi was approved in September 1935, and the first REA-financed line was placed in operation on February 15, 1936, by the Monroe County Electric Power Association of Amory.

Three REA-financed systems have headquarters in the Fifth Congressional District of Mississippi. These are: Central Electric Power Association, Carthage; Southern Pine Electric Power Association, Taylorsville; and the East Mississippi Electric Power Association at Meridian. As of January 1, 1955, these three systems had received loans totaling \$17,668,718 of which \$14,925,943 had been advanced to the borrowers. The systems have 11,115 miles of line in operation serving a total of 40,676 farms and other rural establishments in the district.

In the REA rural telephone program a net total of \$1,973,000 in REA loans had been approved to Mississippi borrowers as of April 1, 1955. These loans, approved to four commercial companies in the State, will make it possible for the borrowers to furnish modern telephone service to 3,771 new subscribers and provide improved service to 1,237 present rural subscribers. Funds actually advanced to the Mississippi telephone borrowers amount to \$1,654,097. As of the first of January this year, the four companies had cut over eight exchanges to modern dial service. In addition to loans already approved, REA had on hand \$1,023,000 in telephone loan applications from organizations in the State.

In 1950, there were 16,436 farms with telephones in Mississippi, representing 6.5 percent of the total. REA's telephone program was started that year.

I shall continue my support of this program in the hope that every rural home in our land may be reached and benefited by the wonderful service afforded by the rural electrification program.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 60]

Anfuso	Eberharter	Powell
Avery	Gamble	Preston
Bolton,	Gary	Reed, N. Y.
Oliver P.	Granahan	Riehlman
Buckley	Gray	Roberts
Burnside	Green, Pa.	Robison, Ky.
Canfield	Heslton	Short
Celler	Hillings	Sleminski
Chatham	Keating	Smith, Miss.
Curtis, Mo.	Morrison	Tumulty
Davis, Ga.	Nelson	Vursell
Dawson, Ill.	Norblad	Wickersham
Diggs	O'Brien, N. Y.	Young
Dingell	Pilcher	Zelenko

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 394 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday for 30 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to vacate the special order granted him for today and to address the House on Tuesday for 10 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6042, with Mr. KROGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday it was agreed that further general debate on the bill continue not to exceed 3 hours, 1 hour to be allotted to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and 2 hours to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation at the outset to the chairman of our Army panel, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]. He has been extremely fair and most constructive during the consideration of this bill in the past 3 months. Also, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] have been most helpful in the consideration of this legislation. We in the minority are grateful. I would be remiss if I failed to praise my competent and conscientious colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

I also feel it essential to say that, in my opinion, the Department of the Army for the past several years has been in good hands. The Secretary of the Army and his civilian associates have done a fine job in the management of that great Department. General Ridgway as Chief of Staff of the Army has been an outstanding leader of men and as a result, in my opinion, the Army is as strong as it has ever been in a peacetime era. Likewise, the Army budget officials, under General Lawton, have been most

helpful and constructive in the manner in which they presented their budget justifications.

As was pointed out yesterday, the Army part of the budget as requested by the President totals \$7,573,980,000 for the fiscal year 1956, which begins July 1, 1955. Our committee, after considerable consideration of this vast amount, decided that the figure for the fiscal year 1956 should be \$7,329,818,000. This would appear to be a reduction of \$244,162,000 in new obligatory authority. This figure is somewhat misleading. In reality there is a bookkeeping transaction which involves \$224,626,000.

Our committee for the past 2 years, and again this year, has not gone along with the Bureau of the Budget recommendation in reference to the use of deutschmark equivalents. The Bureau of the Budget has repeatedly recommended that the Congress appropriate certain sums which were to be deposited with the Treasury so that the Treasury in turn could buy deutschmarks for the operation of our Army and other military services in Europe. Our committee has disapproved of that approach. In contrast we have given the military the authority to use the deutschmark equivalent without a comparable deposit of cash in the Federal Treasury.

In reality, therefore, the only reduction in the Army budget is \$20,504,000, a rather small cutback in a budget which totals seven billion and some five hundred millions of dollars. I support the budget as recommended by this committee.

I think we ought to be cognizant of one point that is quite important. It would appear that the Army budget for fiscal year 1956 is slightly over \$7 billion. That is true, as far as new obligatory authority is concerned. The Army expenditure figure is more important. Army expenditures for last year, this year, and the forecast for next year are anywhere from \$8.5 billion to \$11 billion. When you compare Army expenditures to new obligatory authority, this means that the Army for the last several years, and again for the coming year, will be living off of previously made available obligatory authority. The expenditure figure is a more accurate reflection of what the Army is procuring and what the Army will procure in the future.

During the Korean war the Congress made available to the Army huge sums of money for procurement and production of heavy military equipment. This was necessary and desirable. With the termination of the Korean emergency the Army canceled certain contracts and did not let others. The net result is that a substantial amount of unused obligatory authority was available to the Army. In fiscal years 1954-55 the Army has been using up this obligatory authority for procurement of heavy military equipment.

It is forecast in the President's budget that at the end of fiscal 1956 there will be \$1,658,000,000 still available in this particular appropriation item. The President's budget proposed that the Congress rescind \$800 million of this obligatory authority and make it avail-

able to the Department of Defense for other purposes. The President's budget said that we ought to leave \$858 million worth of this obligatory authority available for fiscal 1957. It was the consensus of our committee that we should leave a total of \$1,658,000,000 available to the Army in the production and procurement item for fiscal 1957. Therefore, on this item we have gone contrary to the President's budget recommendation. However, I should point out that in the committee report we have informed the Department of the Army officials that unless there is an emergency, which is not foreseen at the present time, that \$1,658,000,000 for production and procurement should not be used during fiscal 1956, but should be reserved for fiscal 1957. I have confidence that the Department of the Army will respect our committee's recommendations. I repeat, however, that the present budget or obligatory authority request is not a true reflection of the amount of hardware, military equipment that is being procured for the Army during fiscal 1955 and prospectively for fiscal 1956.

It may be well to point out at this point the unexpended balances which have been in existence and which have been forecast for the Department of the Army.

On June 30, 1954, the Department of the Army had unexpended \$10.6 billion.

On June 30, 1955, 1 year later, it is forecast there will be an unexpended balance of \$12 billion.

On June 30, 1956, it is estimated there will be an unexpended balance of \$9.1 billion.

It might be in order to set forth for the record the unobligated balances which the Army has had and will have on various dates.

On June 30, 1954, the Army had unobligated 7.7 billion.

On June 30, 1955, it is forecast the Army will have unobligated 3.8 billion.

And a year hence, June 30, 1956, the unobligated balance forecast will be 1.7 billion.

I give you these figures to show that the unexpended balances for the Department of the Army for the last 3 years are going down. The unobligated balances are likewise being reduced. This is a creditable reflection on the management of the Department of the Army.

It has been stated in the papers on numerous occasions that because of atomic warfare techniques, the size of the Army must of necessity be increased. Various experts have stated that in this new type of warfare the size of ground forces must of necessity be expanded. I was most anxious to find out the answer to that as best I could during the hearings on this bill. I was particularly interested to find out whether the Army budget as presented for fiscal '56 was based on any strength change resulting from tests conducted on atomic warfare.

On page 107 of the Army hearings, I asked General Ridgway this question:

It is my recollection from the testimony that the Army is now in the process of making certain tests to determine whether that argument is sound or whether no changes are in order.



This referred to changes in ground forces, based on atomic warfare.

Then I continued:

I gather that the argument in favor of more rather than less has not been resolved; is that correct?

And General Ridgway replied as follows:

That is right, sir.

Later on, on the same page, I asked General Ridgway this question:

The net result being that none of that thinking is reflected in any of the figures which have been submitted for fiscal year 1956?

And General Ridgway answered:

That is correct, sir.

Either dollarwise or manpowerwise.

General RIDGWAY. That is correct, sir.

It might well be that, at the conclusion of the various tests and exercises which are now going on, we may have to change the structure of our Army. It may well be that these tests and exercises will show we will have to expand the size of our Army, but as of now and as of the date that this budget was prepared, none of the thinking of the Army in that regard has been firmed up and consequently the problem is not reflected dollarwise or manpowerwise in this Army budget for fiscal '56.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I know the gentleman was a great help on this committee, and he has been most helpful during the consideration of this bill, but on page 107, in the very next sentence of General Ridgway's testimony which the gentleman read, there is also this:

Both are substantially smaller than our present counterparts, and we propose to reach our conclusions sometime this summer or early fall.

So, while what the gentleman said was true, the experiments are going on, and the fact is that it will be this summer or this fall that the conclusion will be reached.

Mr. FORD. I might say to the gentleman that we further explored this problem when the Army training people under General Adams were before us. It is in the record, I do not have the precise citation, that the Army will not conclude any of its exercises, nor will it make its final recommendation until January or possibly until after the first of the year 1956. That is on the record and is part of the hearings.

If you will refer to one other statement on page 108, you will see there that I asked General Ridgway this question:

Mr. FORD. Until we get the results of these field tests, which I presume are now being conducted by the Army, which you expect to finalize sometime in the fall of 1955, it is not fair to relate the arguments pro and con to the fiscal year 1956 budget?

I also quote General Ridgway's answer:

I think that is right, sir.

So, as far as this budget that we are now considering is concerned, it has no relationship to any field test or exercise

the Army is now conducting in reference to future atomic warfare.

I would like to bring up at this point some of the problems which we today will have to face if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] offers one of his amendments. I understand he intends to offer an amendment to the Department of the Army budget which would call for an increase of \$249,574,000. It is my further understanding that he is predicated this increase of approximately \$250 million on an increase of about \$9,000 in Army ground strength.

I think we ought to know that all through the hearings the Army repeatedly stated that it costs \$5,500 to maintain a single soldier for a year. Three thousand two hundred dollars are required for the military pay part of this annual cost and \$2,300 for what we call maintenance and operation, making a total of \$5,500. If this figure is accurate, and that is the figure you can find in numerous places in the hearings, I think we ought to understand the mathematics of the gentleman's proposed amendment.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has indicated that he intends to make available to the Army 89,000 more men in the fiscal year 1956. If you will multiply 89,000 by \$5,500, if my figuring is correct, the total amount is \$489,500,000, rather than the figure of \$249,574,000.

Also, if my mathematics are correct, dividing \$5,500 into \$249 million means that what the gentleman from Pennsylvania intends is to increase the size of the Army by 45,000-plus individuals in the year 1956 rather than the budget strength figure as proposed by General Ridgway.

There is one other matter that I think deserves consideration. It was stated in the newspapers earlier in the calendar year 1955 on numerous occasions that the Soviet military budget had been increased, I believe, by some 12 percent. I have in my hand a copy of the Washington Star for Sunday, February 13, 1955, and I ask you to look at the headlines. It reads: "Red Budget Is Deceptive—A 12-Percent Rise Is Not Necessarily So."

And let me point out, if I may, some of the statements which are made in the article to substantiate the headlines. The author of the article is Mr. Richard Fryklund, who writes:

The 12-percent increase in the Soviet military budget reported when the early figures became available, probably is only a change in bookkeeping.

He goes on to say, and I quote again:

The secret category, however, was significantly smaller; the unaccounted for expenditures had dropped 22 billion rubles, and the cuts came in the portion that was military in nature.

In other words, we do not know whether the Soviet has increased their military budget. At least, some analysts say that is not so. I have just illustrated that there are those who have studied Soviet military budgets in the past are convinced, as I read this article, that the Soviet military budget has not been increased for the current fiscal year.

There has been some comment from time to time in the press that General Ridgway had no opportunity to express

his views to the President, the National Security Council, and others in authority. I refer to General Ridgway's views about the reduction of some 77,000 in the Army strength for fiscal 1956. This disturbed me. Consequently I was most anxious to find out whether General Ridgway's views were indicated to the proper authorities, including the President. On page 111 of the hearings you will find several questions by me trying to pinpoint whether or not General Ridgway's views were made known to proper authorities at the proper time. General Ridgway said:

My clear impression is, sir, that my views as Chief of Staff were known both before and after.

I had previously asked him whether his views had been known before the decision and whether his views had been known subsequent to the decision to make this reduction in the Department of the Army.

If I may, I would like to point out some things that may or may not in the mind of each of you justify the change in the size of the Army for fiscal 1956. It is a very serious decision for each Member to determine whether we should or should not decrease the size of the Army. During the long and comprehensive hearings I tried to approach the problem with an open mind and sought on every occasion to get the facts to justify or not justify the reduction in strength.

It seems to me we ought to realize these facts at the outset: As of July 1, 1955, it was originally forecast that the size of the Army would be 1,100,000. That figure has been revised so that the Army now has 2 more months in fiscal 1956 to get down to that figure. It was forecast in the President's budget for fiscal 1956 that the Army end strength for fiscal 1956 would be 1,025,000 plus 2,400 cadets at West Point. In other words, a year from now, if this budget is approved, the Army will have on July 1, 1956, 1,025,000 on active duty. Compare that, if you will, with the figure of 590,000 which the Army had on active duty as of a date just prior to the Korean war. In other words, the Army on June 30, 1956, will be almost twice as large as it was just prior to the Korean conflict.

There are 4 or 5 important facts that should be set forth so that all of us may honestly make up our own minds on what we should do on this important question. The proper utilization of manpower in the military is vital. Has the Army utilized its manpower effectively? The answer, frankly, is in the record. In the last year or so the Army has done a very commendable job in the effective use of its manpower. Certainly the situation has improved.

In 1952 a very competent and highly thought of committee of the other body prepared a report under the chairmanship of the now distinguished majority leader in that body. I have in my hands a copy of a report on the utilization of manpower by the Armed Forces. The chairman of the committee which issued the report on July 7, 1952, is the distinguished majority leader in the other body. This committee consisted of a

very outstanding group of Members, Senators from the States of Tennessee, Wyoming, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Oregon. It was a very competent group. I would like to read to you what they said in this report. What they said then about efficient military manpower utilization is applicable today. On page 2 the report says:

It has been demonstrated time and again throughout history that sheer numbers are no index of either efficiency or effectiveness.

Then this report also says on page 3:

In the field of manpower, however, our studies have produced a totally different result. Here we have found a high degree of waste—inexcusable waste—and an unconscionable amount of inefficiency. There is no reason why this waste cannot be removed to the benefit both of our defenses and our economic health.

Then it goes on to say, and this is quite interesting, on page 7:

The old Army game of using 5 men to do the work of 1 does not appear to have been discarded when the Air Force divorced the Army.

This was a good report and was very applicable and apropos in 1952. I am proud to say that I think our Army in the past 2 years has followed the advice in this report. I commend the authors of the report and the Army for taking advantage of their recommendations.

What has the Army done about efficient manpower use? The answer is on the record and it is a good record. If you will turn to page 240 of the hearings, you will find a series of questions by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] wanted information about the ratio of combat personnel to total personnel. If you will look at these figures, they are most enlightening. That table submitted by the Army shows that in 1953 the Army had 1,533,815 men on active duty. They had, out of that number, about one-third of their personnel in combat status, our total of 567,343. There noncombat personnel was as follows: 966,472. In other words, they had almost two men who were non-combat for every man that was in a combat status.

Now look at the improvement, and this is significant. In 1956, out of a total strength of 1,025,000, they will have in the combat forces 501,792. They expect to have in the noncombat forces of the Army 523,208. Just about even; almost 1 for 1. That is excellent progress. The Army has followed the suggestions of this distinguished group of men from the other body, and I commend them for it.

The actual change in 3 years is as follows: In noncombat forces the Army has gone from 966,472 to 523,208, a reduction of 443,000 plus. In the combat forces the reduction in 3 years has been 65,551. I remind you that the combat figure of 567,343 was at the height of the Korean war. Since the height of the Korean war we will have only gone down 65,551 in Army combat forces in a 3-year period. During that period the United States went from war to peace. Yes, the Army has done a good job, and

I commend them for it. What they have done is cut away the fat and beefed up, in effect, their relationship of combat forces to total forces.

Let us turn to another problem that is set out on page 260 of the hearings. All during the hearings we heard repeated statements by responsible authorities in the Department of the Army that they were weeding out administrative and like jobs. If the Members will turn to page 260, they will see questions recorded there by me that I asked General Young, who is head of military personnel for the Army. I asked him to pinpoint some of these reductions. In the questions and answers on page 260 you will find that in the fiscal year 1954 and I think fiscal 1955 the Army in two areas reduced 36,000 noncombat jobs. That is a commendable record. After getting these questions and answers on the record, I asked General Young this:

During this period there has been no adverse reflection whatever on the military or combat efficiency of the Army?

The question was asked because he had said they had reduced the need for 36,000 soldiers in the Army. General Young replied:

That is right. I might add that in these manpower surveys, and the study of tables of distribution, we have made considerable progress.

In another part of his testimony, General Young, in reference to a personnel problem, had some comments on reenlistment rates. This Congress in the last session passed legislation to increase reenlistment bonuses. The Congress thought if we could keep career people in the service, the Army would have a lesser training load, and consequently a more effective combat army. During the past several years, the Army was taking in anywhere from 400,000 to 600,000 raw recruits each year. And let me assure you that is expensive in dollars and manpower. It is an expensive luxury, because every time you take in four men as raw recruits, you have to assign, to train them, an average of one experienced soldier. If we can cut down this burdensome training load, we can cut our costs and get a more effective combat army. This reenlistment bonus is aimed at that objective. We have had surprising results in that regard.

On page 256 of the hearings we see this situation. I asked this question:

In other words, by the upsurge in your reenlistments, at least during fiscal year 1955, on the basis of those figures you will save \$75 million approximately?

General Young. That would be one way of expressing it. In addition, Mr. Ford, we feel our combat effectiveness has been greatly improved.

Let us turn to the testimony as shown on page 257. General Young is still the witness. He says:

That is right; yes, sir. You might almost put it this way, Mr. Ford, that because of this favorable trend—which we cannot say for sure will continue but we certainly hope it will—we possibly have achieved almost the equal of the strength of another division which we would not otherwise have accomplished.

By the simple process of paying career people more to stay in the service, in a 6-month period we had 25,000 more men stay on, which, according to General Young's testimony, is equivalent to another Army division.

Yes, I emphasize the Army has done a good job. They have cut down the fat, they have beefed up the relative position of the combat forces. We are now having a lesser training load, which means more soldiers can be in combat status.

There is another factor that ought to be considered here. What is the effect of new and better equipment? It does have a relationship to the size of your Army.

During the hearings, the chairman had before us probably one of the foremost authorities in the Department of Defense on the problem of Army planning. I refer to Major General Gavin, Assistant Chief of Staff for G-3. If you will turn to General Gavin's testimony on page 718, you will find what factors, equipmentwise, he considers to be important. The testimony indicates that in his opinion equipmentwise there are three important factors. One is firepower, the second is mobility, and the third is communications.

What does he say about our position on each score? If you will turn to page 720, you will find questions by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Riley] and answers by General Gavin.

Mr. RILEY. General, could you give me an estimate percentagewise of the increase in firepower in the Infantry in the last 10 years?

General GAVIN. I would say in the last 10 years, about 80 percent.

Mr. RILEY. Would the same thing apply to the mobility, or would that not be quite as great?

General GAVIN. It has been considerable.

Then he goes on and discusses other aspects of it. Further:

Mr. RILEY. And in the next 5 years if your present plans mature, the mobility would be increased considerably over the last 10 years?

General GAVIN. Yes, sir; I would say so. We will make much more progress in the next 5 years than we made in the last 10 years.

Later Mr. RILEY got into the question of communications and asked this question:

Mr. RILEY. Would that same estimate apply in the communications field, or would it not be quite so great in that field?

General GAVIN. I had not thought of it this way, but per pound of weight carried, we can probably communicate twice as far. What I am trying to say, if you double the weight you can probably get twice the range.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is a man in the Department of the Army who is better qualified to discuss these three important factors, firepower, communications, and mobility.

If you will look at his testimony, you will find we have made tremendous technical progress in the last 10 years, and you will see on the record and I can assure you off the record, that the progress we have made is small compared to what



we will make in the months and years ahead.

Let us turn to another aspect of why or why not we should reduce the Army strength figures. I believe the strength of our Reserve forces is an essential factor in this overall problem. I believe all military people, certainly in the Army, concur in that observation.

Here are some figures which are important: In the Army Reserve on June 30, 1953, we had 117,000 men. On June 30, 1956, the Army Reserve expects to have 219,000. In other words, in a 3-year period the Army Reserve strength will go up 102,000.

Let us examine the National Guard figures for the same period. The Guard is an integral and important part of our national defense picture. On June 30, 1953, which was during the Korean war, the National Guard had 265,000 men in their various units. On June 30, 1956, it is estimated the National Guard will have a total of 425,000. In other words, an increase in the 3-year period of 169,000. So in a 3-year period your Reserve forces in the Army will increase 271,000, a substantial bulwarking and bolstering of our active duty Army forces.

The question has been asked, Does this Reserve Manpower Act, which the gentleman from Georgia is bringing up next week, have any bearing on the cut in the Army budget? Frankly, at the beginning, I felt it might have a bearing. However, you will find in our committee hearings testimony to the effect that it has little, if any, effect on the fiscal 1956 manpower strength or dollar figures. So whether the Congress passes or does not pass this legislation during this session, will have little, if any, impact on the budget or the strength figures for the Department of the Army in fiscal 1956.

I call your attention to the testimony of General Ridgway in reference to the effectiveness of our Reserve forces. If you will turn to page 104 of the hearings you will see I was questioning General Ridgway about the importance of our Reserve forces and their effectiveness. Here are the answers to the questions.

General Ridgway is saying:

We think, sir, there is a steady though slow increase in the efficiency of training in the guard. I believe the same would be true, though probably to a slightly lesser degree in the Reserve due to such low strengths of the participating units.

General Milburn, who is in charge of the Reserve program, concurred on the record.

Then I asked this question:

In other words, we can assume that aside from the number increase, there is increased effectiveness of both the Guard and the Reserve?

General MILBURN. Yes, sir.

Then General Ridgway said:

I think also, sir, there has been a steady, although again modest, increase in the training level due to our continuing efforts to get quality in our officer corps in these two civilian components.

Yes, we have not only increased the number, but we have increased the efficiency of the National Guard and the Army Reserve forces, and this does help

to justify the slight reduction in active-duty forces.

We have a number of allies in this world who are as dedicated as we are to the defense of the free world against Communism. I am glad we have them. Right after World War II it became our policy to help them militarily and economically. Frankly, right now we are beginning to get some results.

Let me point out that several days ago Adm. Arthur W. Radford told a committee in the other body, "The military-aid program is part and parcel of the United States defense program."

As you probably know in the foreign-aid budget for fiscal 1956, the President has requested \$1,700,000,000 to help our allies by providing equipment so that they could join us in this fight for freedom against communism. Do you realize how much we have paid in foreign military aid—not economic aid—in the past 5 years? Assistant Secretary of Defense H. Struve Hensel testified before the same committee of the other body just a couple of days ago and said that Uncle Sam has paid \$11 billion to build up the military strength of our allies.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-six Members are present; not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 61]

Anfuso	Gamble	Preston
Borden	Gordon	Reece, Tenn.
Barden	Granahan	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton,	Green, Pa.	Riehlman
Oliver P.	Gubser	Roberts
Buckley	Heslton	Roosevelt
Burdick	Hinshaw	Short
Canfield	Jackson	Slemlinski
Celler	Keating	Smith, Miss.
Chatham	McConnell	Smith, Wis.
Christopher	Morrison	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	Mumma	Tumulty
Dawson, Ill.	Norblad	Wickersham
Diggs	Norrell	Young
Dingell	O'Brien, N. Y.	Zelenko
Dorn, S. C.	Pilcher	
Eberhart	Powell	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6042, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 381 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, at the time of the quorum call, I was discussing the interrelationship of the military-aid program and our own military budget. I indicated that Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, several days ago, in testifying before a committee of the other body, had said:

The military-aid program is part and parcel of the United States Defense Department program.

The headline of this newspaper article says: "Radford Says Aid Cuts Size of United States Forces."

I had just brought out at that time that Assistant Secretary of Defense H. Struve Hensel had told a committee in the other body that in the last 5 years Uncle Sam had contributed \$11 billion in military aid for our allies.

Included in the foreign-aid budget for fiscal 1956 is another \$1,700,000,000 for military aid and assistance to our allies who are joined with us in this effort to stop communism over the world.

How have we as a nation benefited from this \$11 billion expenditure? We now have in being 20 South Korean divisions, plus 1 marine regiment, and certain ROK reserve forces. The money we have spent in South Korea has been vast, but definite results have accrued. For example, General Ridgway testified in the hearings that when he was there he had only 10 South Korean divisions, and they were poorly trained and not entirely adequate. Our funds and equipment have doubled the size and effectiveness of the ROKs. In turn, we can revise our own forces.

So we spend money for our allies but we have gotten results. We have gotten good, strong foot soldiers who can do the job in the far corners of the earth better than ours, giving us as a Nation responsibility to use our talents in the air and on the sea where we are best equipped and best qualified.

We do not have them now, but we will in a relatively short time, maybe a year, a year and a half, or two years, have 12 crack German Army divisions. We expect to have in the not too far distant future a total German Army, Navy, and Air Force of some 500,000. Uncle Sam has already provided most of the equipment for this potentially powerful German military machine.

In addition, we expect to have in being, and I think the record can probably show, at least the newspapers have indicated, substantial Japanese ground forces. We expect to have between 10 and 12 divisions by taking those fine soldiers in Japan, ground soldiers, and adding them to the free world forces. It permits us as a Nation to concentrate our efforts in the air and on the sea.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Will my friend tell us when we expect to have 10 or 12 divisions of Japanese troops? I am afraid he is going to find that is as far distant as the German forces which, by General Gruenther's statement, are about 4 years in the future. I said yesterday 2 to 4, putting the best figure I could on it. My dear friend knows I have the highest regard for him, and I am not trying to disrupt his statement, but I believe his statement of 10 to 12 divisions is an optimistic one, certainly if he means at any near time.

Mr. FORD. I would say to the distinguished chairman of my committee that whether we call the 110,000 Japanese police force divisions or a police force,

they are a decided improvement over the days following World War II, when the Japanese Army was completely disbanded. I am not saying that the Japanese Army has today or will have in 6 months 10 to 12 divisions, but they have around 110,000 of what they call a Japanese police force, which I think could do a pretty creditable job. They are easily transferable to strong, effective army units.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I came in a little late and have not heard all of the very fine presentation the gentleman from Michigan is making. I am just wondering whether the gentleman has pointed out the fact that the completion of the Austrian Treaty will relieve 15,000 American soldiers who can be used elsewhere and brought back home.

I also wonder whether the gentleman has called to the attention of the House a statement made by General Ridgway, which will be found on the bottom of page 81 of the Department of the Army hearings, in which, discussing the increased manpower and firepower of World War II divisions, he said:

We could beef up the firepower on a percentage basis of our divisions 500 percent or maybe 10,000 percent, by putting a few of these atomic weapons in the division. They are not in the division today, as you know, sir.

Mr. FORD. I appreciate the very constructive and most helpful comments of the gentleman from Kansas. That is important information which, I think, the House should know because it does involve whether or not we should approve the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood]. I think we ought to remember that over the past 5 years, we, as a Nation, have spent over \$11 billion in foreign military aid plus sizable amounts of foreign economic aid and assistance. It was predicated and based on the theory, and I hope the practice, that as our friends and allies around the world beefed up and bolstered their military strength in areas and in fields where they can do the best job—on the ground—we, as a Nation, could concentrate our forces in the skies and on the waters. That is what this budget is based on today. It accentuates our air power. It accentuates continental defense program for protection of our own people.

Yes; I think the issues will be clearly drawn later this afternoon. The gentleman from Pennsylvania intends to offer an amendment adding \$249 million for the Army which, according to my mathematical calculations, would put on active duty approximately 44,000 or 45,000 more men in the Army. If that figure is correct the strength will not be up to what some people in the Department of the Army feel is necessary. If you put it up to the figure which General Ridgway, I believe, thinks is necessary, you will have to add to the present budget \$489 million in 1

year and not \$250 million. If you approve the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, you must realize that the draft call by the Selective Service will go up so far as the monthly requirements are concerned from 10,000 to anywhere between 15,000 and 20,000. Yes; are you going to increase the call of the draft in order to increase the size of the Army when the President of the United States, probably, the greatest military expert we have in the world today, when Admiral Arthur Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, when Admiral Carney, of the Navy, when General Sheperd, Commandant of the Marines, and General Twining, of the Air Force, are all on record endorsing this budget? It is a serious responsibility for each and every one of us but I say you have to weigh on the scales the extra cost of some \$250 million to \$480 million plus a doubling of your selective-service call against the military and civilian judgment of the men I have mentioned, the President, and the various members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, permit me at the outset, as a member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], who has presided over our work and our deliberations during the past year. He has been eminently fair and he commands the deep respect of each and every member of the committee, not only for the method and manner in which he handles the affairs of this important committee, but for his many courtesies and his consideration of the other members. May I also pay tribute to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], who is the ranking Republican member with whom I have served on the Navy panel during the past 3 or 4 years. I should also like to pay tribute, Mr. Chairman, to the distinguished chairman of the Navy panel, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] has a long and distinguished career as a member of this committee, particularly his devotion, his applied knowledge, and his application to the problems dealing with our Navy. I am sure I need not tell the Members of this House of the tremendous responsibilities that go with the work of this important subcommittee. Hearings, as you well know, begin early in the year and last anywhere from 4 to 5 months, hearings dealing with the vast operations involving our Military Establishment.

Mr. Chairman, this is concededly a difficult period for military planning. We must have enough military might to protect ourselves against aggression, yet not so much that it will topple our economy. We must make maximum use of the terrible destructive power of nuclear weap-

ons, while conserving what is indispensable in our traditional forces and concepts. We must be ready for massive retaliation in the event of attack, while enabling a maximum number of our people to enjoy the blessings of peaceful pursuits. And always, we must bear in mind that our ultimate objective is not war but peace. Thus, it is a period of transition in military planning, and subject to all of the stresses and strains, difficulties and misunderstandings that such a period entails.

In considering the bill before us, it is imperative to bear in mind the concepts of military planning enunciated by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson. Let me repeat them here. Very briefly, he said in part:

The forces envisaged in this long-range program of the Department of Defense constitute by far the largest Military Establishment that this country has ever undertaken to maintain for an indefinite period of time. With the incorporation into our Military Establishment of the new weapons that we have developed, they constitute a force of tremendous striking power. We believe that this program developed over many months represents the general order of magnitude of the size forces that the country can effectively maintain, can improve, on a qualitative basis, and that the economy of the country can continue to support.

Mr. Chairman, within that framework, then the Committee's recommendations envision new spending authority for the coming fiscal year of \$31.4 billion. This amount, together with obligated and unobligated balances, will provide the Department with total funds available for expenditure in the coming year of \$74.6 billion.

The committee has become increasingly concerned with the size of the carryover funds, which now measurably exceed the annual appropriations. They are, in part, the result of the transitional planning to which I referred earlier, but they also reflect the tendency on the part of the Department, to ask for more than it needs, and to squirrel away what it cannot immediately use. To the extent that the carryover cover financing of long-lead items or are essential to the maintenance of industrial-type activities, they are, of course, essential. But the committee believes they have grown far beyond that point, and should be reduced.

It was brought to the committee's attention, for example, that the Department last December transferred to its stock and industrial funds over a billion dollars in unexpended moneys, although it had foreseeable need for only a limited part of that money. The committee has therefore provided that further transfers of currently available funds be made only with its approval, and that future justifications contain adequate explanation of all proposed plans and programs of stock and industrial operations. In addition, it has ordered recission of \$1,649,000,000 in working capital funds. This represents cash sequestered by the Department in excess of needs for activities operated on revolving fund principles.

It should be pointed out that the greatest opportunities for economies in



the maintenance of our large defense establishment exist in the field of procurement, and almost half the total sum recommended for appropriation for fiscal 1956 is for procurement. The existence of large, unobligated carryovers does more than dull the appetite for economy; it whets the tendency to overbuy and overspend. In this respect, a leaner budget is a better budget for all concerned.

Other members of the committee have dwelt at some length on the funds provided for the Army and Air Force. As a member of the Navy panel, I would like to point out some salient features of the bill affecting the Navy and Marine Corps.

Reflecting the overall policy enunciated by the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Navy Thomas has described our present naval policy as comprised of seven essential elements: namely, first, capacity for massive retaliation of a magnitude not only to deter war but to overwhelm the attacker; second, a hard core of mobile land, sea, and air forces, capable of withstanding the initial onslaught of an enemy assault; third, sea supremacy; fourth, a continental defense program; fifth, a quickly expandable reserve program; sixth, an industrial mobilization base designed for rapid expansion; and seventh, research and development to maintain our lead in weapons.

In furtherance of these objectives, the committee has recommended the appropriation of \$9,180,157,000 for the Navy and Marine Corps for fiscal 1956. While this is about a half billion less than funds for the current year, the appropriation will provide for an increased shipbuilding and conversion program; an increase in size and power of the naval air arm; and higher pay for personnel as envisioned in the Career Incentive Act.

It envisions a fleet of 1,001 ships, with measurable improvement in their capabilities as the result of the acquisition of new, and newly converted vessels. About 100 vessels will be retired. A shipbuilding and conversion program, contemplated in the bill, will provide 34 new ships and vessels in future years, including a fifth carrier of the *Forrestal* class, 8 submarines, of which 3 will be nuclear-powered, and 13,370 tons of landing craft. The bill also provides for conversion of 28 ships and vessels.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman refers to the retirement of 100 vessels in 2 years, 65, I think, in the fiscal year 1956. Is it not a fact that the record indicates that those vessels are small type landing craft and similar small ships which can be taken out of mothballs and put into active duty again if necessary within 30 days time?

Mr. OSTERTAG. The gentleman from Massachusetts is correct in that statement, and I think it is important to note that the retirement of these vessels only means that they can readily

and quickly be utilized in case of emergency.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, it is also true that of the proposed ships to be retired, the 100 ships to be retired, over 90 percent are amphibious ships or amphibious small boats which are necessary and essential for the Marine Corps in amphibious operations. Is that not true?

Mr. OSTERTAG. That is true, but they can be readily available for use if and when necessary.

Admiral Carney's estimate of this program is that it will improve the Navy's air striking power; maintain our submarine and antisubmarine capabilities, with possible improvements as a result of new developments; maintain essentially the same offensive and defensive capabilities in the mine forces, and curtail in some measure the staying power of the fleet.

I should like to bring forcibly to the attention of the Members of the House that the Navy plays an important role in our air defense and with respect to naval air the bill envisions 10,061 daily operating aircraft out of a total of 13,027 active planes. That is in the Navy alone. It makes available approximately \$7 billion in these funds and carryovers for the procurement of approximately 1,600 aircraft for the Navy.

As provided in earlier legislation, there will be reductions in personnel in both the Navy and the Marine Corps, with the Navy reducing its forces by 54,000 men in the coming year, to provide strength of 657,000 by the end of June 1956. The Marine Corps will be reduced by 8,000 in the coming year, for an end strength in June 1956 of 193,000. It is significant and laudable that the major part of these reductions will be accomplished through cuts in supporting forces, rather than combat forces, although some reductions will be accomplished through the retirement of vessels in the active fleet and a moderate reduction in fleet-manning levels.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. In reference to the Navy, may I ask a question on section 639, which says:

No part of the funds appropriated in this act may be used for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise of work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense.

What is the intention of the committee as to the words "traditionally performed?" Is that any work that is at the present time performed by a naval or military installation?

Mr. OSTERTAG. The gentleman's point is well taken. Perhaps we should accept the word "traditional" in the general meaning of the term. That is, general custom or the general habits or the practice. I shall be happy to yield to the member of the committee who is familiar with the purpose of the amendment, namely, the gentleman from Florida

[Mr. SIKES]. I am sure he has some comment as to the meaning, the intent and purpose of the language.

Mr. SIKES. I think my good friend from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] has very well analyzed the meaning of the word "traditional." It is, of course, intended to convey something that is customary, something that has been done for a number of years. It would be difficult to put a time limit on it, but I would have no objection if the House wants to write in 3 or 5 years to tie it down. When you say "traditional", you mean something that is customary.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Does that answer the question?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

Mr. OSTERTAG. May I again point out that these reductions that I have referred to are in line with the policies projected by the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense on the basis of world conditions, on the basis of new weapons and on the basis of changing concepts of military strategy.

In line, also, with these policies is the provision of funds to permit further expansion of naval and Marine Corps reserve organizations.

On the whole, Mr. Chairman, the bill before you will provide the necessary armed strength and security for our country in the immediate future. It lays the groundwork for the new directions which our strategic planning must take in the light of new weapons now becoming available to us. It gives due recognition, I am sure, to the impact of our Military Establishment on our domestic economy, and it provides a program that is both durable and enduring, a program that will encourage our friends and a program that will discourage our enemies, and, above all, give confidence and security to the people of these great United States.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have had an opportunity as a member of this committee to bring this important bill to you, and I hope that these funds and this appropriation and this measure will warrant the wholehearted support of the Members of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, for approximately 5 hours we have been debating the defense appropriation bill for 1956, and I am quite sure that some Members perhaps are growing weary and tired. However, those of us who are charged with the responsibility of trying to justify a \$31.5 billion defense budget, approximately 75 percent of the national budget, feel very heavily the responsibility of trying to at least place in the Record sufficient evidence to warrant our stewardship.

Mr. Chairman, it is a significant honor to serve with the other 14 members of the subcommittee handling the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1956.

For many long weeks, we have labored together. Our hearings began on January 31 and continued through April 1, meeting almost every day from 10 o'clock

in the morning until 5 o'clock and later in the afternoon.

The chairman of our Defense Appropriation Subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas, Congressman MAHON, who likewise served as chairman of our Air Force panel on which I was honored to serve, has inspired all of us as we shared together the responsibility in trying to evaluate the problems and the policy which determine the size and role of our military establishments.

To the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] the Congress, the administration, and the country, owes a great debt of gratitude as the House begins to consider this defense budget.

My other 14 colleagues on the committee brought to our deliberations an intelligent knowledge of our overall national policy as well as an understanding of the detailed programs and problems upon which that policy depends.

The ramifications of the Department of Defense and this defense budget staggers the imagination in size and complexity. You feel a terrific responsibility. While the total pages of any hearing are not conclusive evidence of a job well done, yet our hearings will reveal that in no previous hearings have Department of Defense witnesses ever faced a more severe probing.

The overall Department of Defense hearings consists of 826 pages of testimony, the Army hearings involve 1,538, the Navy 1,241, and the Air Force 1,544. A total of 5,149 pages. This does not include off-the-record testimony which would increase the evidence by at least 3,000 pages.

I am reasonably sure that the American people have no conception of the tremendous influence, economically and politically, that is involved by the appropriation in this defense budget. It not only concerns America, but the international projections are highly significant.

This committee is certainly the custodian of not only many military secrets but our recommendations and the actions of this House on this budget will have exceedingly far-reaching implications.

#### EVALUATING THE TESTIMONY

It is not an easy matter to evaluate all this evidence, yet that is our responsibility to the membership of this House and to the American people. We could only hope that each Member of the House would take the time to carefully review the hearings and submit to our chairman and the executive secretaries of our panels your views on how we may improve upon our craftsmanship.

Speaking of our executive secretaries, I certainly feel greatly indebted to Samuel W. Crosby, who served as executive secretary to our Air Force panel, and also Ralph Preston, of our Air Force committee staff. Each of the panels is served by dedicated public servants.

Mr. Chairman, before we can justify a budget we should determine what is the policy and the program upon which this budget is based. I conceive it our duty to keep in mind these objectives as we think of the entire national defense budget.

It is the duty of your committee—

To relate the budget to the policy and programs which are designed to secure the national defense;

To improve the budget procedures;

To control the expenditure of funds;

To bring about better organization of the Department of Defense in order to promote economy and efficiency; and

To insure that the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines have the capability of performing their missions.

It was with these objectives in mind that your Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations came to grips with the Department of Defense budget estimates.

And, Mr. Chairman, if we have failed, as members of the committee, to reach those objectives, then we have not finished our task.

#### OVERALL NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY

The program that the military budget makes possible is only one factor in the general pattern of defense that the United States has developed to meet the problem of national defense and to preserve the ideological integrity of the Western World.

Since our objective is to prevent war and to insure peace, we shall use every measure short of war to maintain stable international relations.

This national concept was further amplified in the words of George Washington wherein it was laid down that the United States would not become involved in entangling foreign alliances. For 150 years we have held to this fundamental precept.

In the 19th century it was crystal clear how this could be defined and implemented, first, because of the lack of communication; and, second, the United States in its infancy was not involved in international struggles based on conflicts of race, ideologies, or religion.

During and since World War II the struggle continues to control the minds of men and nations. Within recent years our Government has attempted to develop a national policy to protect the country and still adhere to the fundamental principles expressed by George Washington. It is not as simple as before.

It has been said that war is an instrument of national policy, but I think we are able to calculate that the consequences of a thermonuclear war practically rule out this method of settling international disputes since a total atomic war would destroy even the institutions and the way of life we are seeking to preserve. We have, therefore, emphasized collective security arrangements with our allies, foreign aid, the United Nations as an international forum for the discussion and possible settlement of disputes, the control of subversive activities within the Nation, and the necessity for a healthy economy.

Our course is still one of walking down the tightrope of pursuing a policy of nonaggression, endeavoring to maintain adequate striking power to counter aggression successfully in sufficient time and without becoming overembroiled in compromising basic philosophies.

President Monroe, our fifth President, defined American policy when he said:

The United States would consider any foreign power establishing a foothold in this continent as an active aggression against the United States.

We have for a long time adhered to this principle. In the 19th century our frontier was clearly defined as our shoreline. In modern times this frontier, not within the definition of international law, but within the concept thereof we have been pushed across the oceans when thinking of our own national security and in order to effectively protect our shorelines. This is readily apparent when you think of supersonic jet speeds, intelligence reports, and the fact that communism has conquered approximately one-fourth of the land area of the world and approximately one-third of the people of the world.

Added to this is the growing military capability of communism, which is evident in their possession of thermonuclear bombs and planes to deliver them on western targets. We are aware, perhaps more acutely than when these words were first spoken by Jefferson that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Our Military Establishment is a necessary part of a vigilant attitude, and if we think of it as a kind of police force in being to maintain order in the international community, we can see that its strength and efficiency constitute strong deterrents to any would-be aggressor. Or to put this point another way—without such military strength we could not be as successful in using diplomatic, economic, and political methods to attain our security objectives.

The overall policy which determines the size and shape of the Military Establishment is of primary concern to the Appropriations Committee. Secretary Wilson testified with regard to the military forces required for this policy:

The maintenance of these forces and their qualitative improvement will require expenditures over an indefinite period of years of many billions of dollars.

We know that our national security policy has been determined by the President, the National Security Council, and insofar as military matters are concerned, has been influenced by the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Thus we have as many safeguards as we can devise in formulating overall policy. But the policy cannot be implemented unless funds are appropriated. The Congress must insist upon a close interrelationship between these factors—the policy, the program, and the budget. It is not only a question of having an adequate Military Establishment to underwrite our policy; it is also a question of having an adequate policy to underwrite our national security.

#### EVERY NATION FREE UNDER GOD

The United States wants peace in the world. We have made our peaceful intentions very clear. While our servicemen are stationed in every country of the world, we have no desire and neither are we trying to impose our will upon any nation. Wherever our forces are



today, they have been invited. There is no colonization. We want every nation to be free under God.

#### THE MILITARY PROGRAM

The size of the Armed Forces, and the reasoning which led to the conclusion that our active duty strength should be set at approximately 2,949,000 by June 30, 1955, was set forth in a letter by President Eisenhower to Secretary of Defense Wilson on January 5, 1955. The President was concerned with the minimum defensive structure that should be supported by the Nation in line with our long-term security. We cannot maintain such large standing forces that our economy would be impaired, and therefore it has been decided that the active duty strength will be built up qualitatively with a maximum dependence on science and technology. A substantial portion of the budget has been allotted to research and development. Our military forces are to be mobile so that they can be rapidly deployed from the continental United States in the event of war. In addition, the Regular forces may be augmented by the armed strength of our allies with whom we have collective security agreements, as well as by our own trained Reserves who will ultimately number 2.9 million under the proposed national Reserve plan.

Under the current plans made possible by the 1956 fiscal budget, the total military strength of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force will be reduced to 2,859,000 by June 30, 1956. The actual end strength for fiscal 1954 was 3,302,100, while the estimate for fiscal 1955 is 2,961,300. After the annual printed budget was submitted, there was an increase in personnel that was approved in the total amount of 35,000. This provided an additional 25,000 for the Army; 7,000 for the Navy; and 3,000 for the Marine Corps. In addition to this increase, the committee recommended that 4,400 ROTC officers who graduate during the fiscal year but cannot be absorbed under the national Reserve plan, be given their commissions.

Successive reductions in the Army for the last 3 fiscal years show an actual strength of 1,404,600 as of June 30, 1954, and an estimated strength of 1,114,000 as of June 30, 1955. The projected strength of 1,027,000 by June 30, 1956 was somewhat changed on April 19, 1955 when Secretary Wilson said that the reduction in Army personnel would be somewhat slower than had been planned. By June 30, 1955 the Army will have 1,125,000 rather than 1,102,000—the lower figure will not be reached until 2 months later. This will permit the Army to have 15 combat divisions, 11 regiments, and 135 antiaircraft battalions. Three training divisions will also be available to implement the Army's new divisional rotation program.

The actual strength of the Navy for June 30, 1954 was 725,720, while the current estimate for June 30, 1955 is 672,353. By June 30, 1956 it is expected that naval strength will have been cut to 664,035. Carrier air groups will increase from 16 to 17, a new carrier will be

added to the fleet, and 15 antisubmarine warfare squadrons will be kept in readiness. Over \$1.3 billion is being made available for building new ships and modernizing old ones. In addition, the Navy will have 13,000 aircraft, 10,000 of which will operate in the Navy, the Marine Active and Reserve Air units.

Comparable statistics for the Marine Corps indicate that on June 30, 1954, the active strength was 223,868; by June 30, 1955, it was estimated that this figure would be cut to 205,000. The projected strength of the Marines by June 30, 1956 is 193,000. The Department estimates, however, that this strength will enable the marines to maintain 3 air wings and 3 combat divisions.

On the other hand, neither the budget nor the military posture it provides would be sufficient to take care of a war of the Korean type—additional funds would have to be requested. We cannot guarantee with this program that we can assure the people of 100 percent continental air defense against nuclear attacks, but that is a matter not merely of money and men, but of technological developments and time. The budget does include a substantial strengthening of this important element in our defense. Actually the military program seems to be considered adequate if the international situation continues along pretty much as at present, and is sufficient to take care of the beginning of a bad situation. But as Admiral Radford testified, new intelligence information of any attack or any serious deterioration in the international situation would necessitate an increase in our military strength and consequently in our appropriations.

The underlying idea upon which our defense system rests was stated by the President in his state of the Union message to Congress on January 6, 1955. After noting that the military threat of increasing Communist nuclear strength was only one menace to our freedom and security—a situation which requires many counteracting methods—the President said:

To protect our nations and our peoples from the catastrophe of a nuclear holocaust, free nations must maintain countervailing military power to persuade the Communists of the futility of seeking to advance their ends through aggression. If Communist rulers understand that America's response to aggression will be swift and decisive—that never shall we buy peace at the expense of honor or faith—they will be powerfully deterred from launching a military venture engulfing their own peoples and many others in disaster. Now this, of course, is a form of world stalemate. But in this stalemate each of us—every American—may and must exercise his high duty to strive in every honorable way for enduring peace.

The military strength of the Air Force reflects a slight increase. On June 30, 1954, the actual strength of the Air Force was 947,900; on June 30, 1955, the estimated strength figure is 970,000; and by June 30, 1956 it is expected that the number will reach 975,000. The Air Force is scheduled to build up to its 137-wing target strength with 975,000 men, and although this is an increased per-

sonnel figure during the last 3 years, it represents quite a reduction from the former plan of having 143 wings with 1,210,000 men. It is not expected that we shall attain the 137-wing goal until June 30, 1957.

This gives us some idea of the strength of our forces and the amount of materiel they will have available to accomplish their missions. They must be ready to defend the United States in line with our continental defense system, and be capable of carrying out a retaliatory attack against enemy aggression. It will be necessary for the Navy to keep open and protect the sea lanes and to be prepared to use its carrier-based planes. The Army must be able to take care of any conflicts that might develop on land, not only in limited wars or local aggressions, but also in the initial phases of a war that threatened to be global.

What can we expect from this military posture, and, even more importantly, what must we not expect? Admiral Radford said that the program would permit us to make stable plans on a long-term basis, to take care of the initial phases of a global war, to launch a retaliatory attack, to have mobile forces to supplement indigenous troops, and to meet local aggressions. This policy means, of course, that there is an increased emphasis on air power. And this fact, in turn, presents a grave responsibility to the Congress in considering the appropriations for the Air Force. Having been a member of the subcommittee that dealt with the Department of the Air Force appropriations for fiscal 1956, I feel a special concern about reporting the progress of our work to the House.

#### KEY WEST AGREEMENT

As you will recall the mission given to the Air Force by the Key West agreement of 1948 to gain and maintain general air supremacy is a gigantic task, considering the space involved and the increasing air strength of the sworn enemies of our way of life. Associated with the increasing air strength of any potential enemy is the tremendous increase in the destructive capability of the elements of that force, requiring a degree of alertness and readiness that has never before been approached in peacetime.

#### THE NEW AIR FORCE MISSION

The vital importance of the time element in any future conflict necessitates a departure from the old concepts; time will not permit the traditional dispersion of trained forces to form the nuclei of new units for training and subsequent commitment to the operations in progress. The units must be capable of immediate commitment to battle, either in place or after deployment to their preselected wartime location.

To overcome the time factor, the Air Force must preposition certain personnel and supplies in overseas units during peacetime. These units have many and varied responsibilities. Among these are the maintenance of—

First. An air warning net.

Second. An immediately available air defense, strategic, and tactical air capability.

Third. A base complex to accommodate additional forces to be deployed from the Zone of the Interior.

Fourth. A headquarters and logistics structure to direct and support the operations.

Fifth. Facilities to conduct airlift operations, including aeromedical evacuation of patients, for the Department of Defense.

Sixth. Facilities to perform air rescue, weather, air traffic, communications security, and airways communications functions.

Seventh. Facilities to test high-yield weapons and the operational suitability of material under extremely cold weather conditions.

Eighth. Support for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, military assistance advisory groups, military missions, and military attachés.

In accomplishing these missions, the Air Force will have approximately a quarter of a million men in uniform overseas by the end of fiscal year 1956; another 15,000 will be in transient status to and from overseas to support this deployment. These men are to be stationed in practically every country in the world, with the personnel strengths ranging from a single attaché to complete combat-ready forces. Geographically, the majority will be in the European and far Atlantic areas, the Far East, and Pacific areas, and the northern periphery of the United States. Additional forces will be maintained in the southern and near Atlantic areas. These programs are tied directly to the overall implementation of the 137-wing Air Force by end of fiscal year 1957.

#### AIR FORCE PROGRAM

The main operations that the Air Force must be prepared to perform, and we must insure that appropriations are adequate to result in these capabilities, are concerned with first, the Strategic Air Command; second, the Tactical Air Command; third, continental defense; fourth, the airlift, and various support functions. The subcommittee heard extensive testimony on the recent progress and present degree of readiness of these vital parts of the Air Force.

The testimony indicated that the readiness and quality of the Strategic Air Command are constantly improving. The retaliatory forces of this command are on a 24-hour alert basis, and it seems indisputable that the preparedness of our striking forces has been a major factor, indeed we might say the main reason, in preventing any major military aggression.

Our medium-bomber wings have been 80 percent converted from B-29 and B-50 planes to the B-47 jets, and will be 100-percent jet-propelled by the end of 1955.

The long-range B-52 bombers are adding to our strategic bombing power because of their increased speed, range, and combat ceiling.

A new jet tanker makes it possible to refuel the B-52's in the air and thus frees the Strategic Air Command from de-

pendence on bases that are not located in the United States.

As for the base situation, it is clear that this is a problem that must remain uppermost in the minds of the committee members as we determine ways and means of increasing the number of bases and assuring their dispersal.

In addition to these measures, there is a high-priority program for the development of intercontinental ballistic missiles and nuclear airplanes.

In considering the adequacy of the appropriations for this program, the subcommittee realizes that there are two sides to this coin; one is the capability of the striking force, the other is the equally important capability of the defensive Continental Air Force. We recognize, as the committee report points out, that—

The strength of our Air Force at present rests more on counteroffensive capability than actual defense.

This situation seems to be inevitable at this particular juncture of affairs as we have been going from a point in time when the United States had a monopoly on nuclear weapons into a period when our possible enemies have also developed the means of striking at our own country. The committee intends to adopt all possible measures to insure that this gap is closed. The existence of strong defensive air forces will be just as great a deterrent to enemy attack as fear of retaliation.

The Continental Air Defense Command is therefore being strengthened through the appropriation of funds to improve our early warning net, to develop fighter aircraft and guided missiles as a protection against enemy planes, and to improve the communication and control system which connects the weapons system with the early warning network.

The Tactical Air Command is also being programmed to increase its capability for offense and defense. The new fighter-bomber aircraft are coming off the lines and have been built so they can be equipped with nuclear weapons.

In view of the fact that the size and equipment of our Armed Forces are determined in accordance with requirements for mobility and flexibility, the

airlift operation must be developed to the point where essential needs can be met. If we are prepared to transport only troops to some trouble spot, the meaning of mobility would be lost if we could not also supply these troops.

It would certainly appear that in the buildup of MATS, high priority should be given to the problem of logistics. This is an example of the type of problem that cannot be solved merely by the appropriation of funds; it also requires determination on the part of the Air Force and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to see that a program is worked out in accordance with various types of military situations that might have to be met.

#### THE AIR FORCE BUDGET

Because I served on the Air Force panel that is responsible for the Air Force budget, I would like to give a brief account of the progress that has been made in reviewing their policy, programs, and expenditures.

It is not possible, of course, to consider the Air Force in isolation from the other services. It must first be related to the total defense budget and our strategy for national security.

To put the matter briefly, I know that you want answers to the same questions the subcommittee asked.

Why has the Defense Department and particularly the Air Force requested a budget of this size?

What have they asked for?

Will the appropriation result in a Defense Establishment that is capable of protecting the vital interests of the United States?

Our chairman, Mr. MAHON; the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], chairman of the Army panel; the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], chairman of the Navy panel; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee; and other members of the committee have spoken for the overall appropriations recommended in the bill for the budget year 1956. As a part of my remarks, I will insert a summary of the appropriations for 1955, the budget estimate for 1956, and the amount recommended in the bill before you, and will limit my remarks to the Department of the Air Force.

#### Summary of appropriations

Title	Appropriations, 1955	Budget estimates, 1956	Recommended in bill, 1956	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1955	Budget estimates, 1956
Title I—Office of the Secretary of Defense	\$12,750,000	\$12,750,000	\$12,400,000	—\$350,000	—\$350,000
Title II—Interservice activities	527,500,000	1 682,250,000	672,250,000	+144,750,000	—10,000,000
Title III—Department of the Army	7,619,066,986	1 7,573,980,000	7,329,818,000	—289,248,986	—244,162,000
Title IV—Department of the Navy	9,712,823,500	1 9,180,157,000	9,071,834,000	—640,989,500	—108,323,000
Title V—Department of the Air Force	10,927,930,000	1 14,783,678,000	14,401,904,000	+3,473,974,000	—381,774,000
Total	28,800,070,486	1 32,232,815,000	31,488,206,000	+2,688,135,514	—744,609,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$827,815,000 in H. Doc. 145 as follows: Interservice Activities, \$55,000,000; Army, \$284,980,000; Navy, \$234,157,000; Air Force, \$253,678,000.

NOTE.—In addition to the above reduction, the following rescissions are made: Construction of ships, Navy (1948-1951 programs), \$8,572,000 prior contract authorization; Working Capital Funds, \$1,649,000,000, as follows: Army, \$700,000,000; Navy, \$469,000,000; Marine Corps, \$25,000,000; Air Force, \$445,000,000.



THE AIR FORCE MUST ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR  
THE AIR FORCE BUDGET

A study of the hearings will, I feel, reveal the fact that the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Talbott; the Chief of Staff, General Twining; the Director of the Air Force Budget, General Bogart; and their associates, civilian and military, in the Department of the Air Force are making every honest effort to achieve economies.

On the other hand the officials of the Department of the Air Force must assume a heavy responsibility in the acceptance of approximately 50 percent of the total defense dollar. The 1957 budget estimates will reveal whether or not the application of the new program of financial management in the Department of the Air Force is what it is claimed to do; namely, effect economies and savings.

AIR FORCE BUDGET

The budget requests for the Air Force are based upon reaching a 137-wing goal by 1957 with 975,000 military and 330,000 civilian personnel. By the end of fiscal 1956, it is anticipated that we shall have 131 wings which is well in advance of scheduled plans. The Air Force estimates came to \$14,783,678,000 which included a supplemental request of \$253,678,000 to take care of the cost of the personnel benefits contained in the Career Incentive Act of 1955. These requests total \$3,855,748,000 more than the Congress appropriated for fiscal 1955 to cover the same operations.

After all these requests were considered, both by the subcommittee and the full committee, a recommendation was made to appropriate \$14,401,904,000 which is \$381,774,000 less than the Department requested, but \$3,473,974,000 more than the amount granted by Congress for fiscal 1955. The committee considered that these amounts were adjustments rather than reductions inasmuch as they permit a closer relation between dollar requirements and the planned program but at the same time do not interfere with the expansion of the Air Force to the desired strength goals.

The problem of relating funds and program occupied much of the subcommittee's time, the acute point being the large amount of carryover funds. While this is a problem that concerns the entire Department of Defense, and all three of the armed services, it was natural that the Subcommittee on Air Force Appropriations should ask searching questions with regard to the practice in that Department. The reason for the subcommittee's concern is easy to understand: If the members approve the expenditure of vast sums of money which are said to be necessary for the national defense, and then find that year after year the estimates of what is needed are billions of dollars in excess of what is spent, and that these funds are carried over from fiscal year to fiscal year; then it might appear that either the committee has been lax in looking into the true situation—or it is permitting loose fiscal practices in the Pentagon—or the Congress is losing control of the programs by the time the money is actually being spent.

There must be some explanation of this situation and some means of bringing it under control, especially during a time when the Nation is not in a shooting war and when the overall policy is based upon leveling off for the long pull.

AIR FORCE CARRYOVER

The Air Force indicated that in its no-year funds as of June 30, 1954, there was a \$7 billion carryover. The estimate for June 30, 1955, was \$5.7 billion, a figure that includes \$1.05 billion of MDA funds. For fiscal 1956 the estimated carryover—exclusive of construction funds—is \$3.7 billion. It is clear that there is sound reasoning behind having some carryover funds. They are necessary to a policy of planned procurement of aircraft over a 4-year fiscal period during which the Department has to take into account the time necessary for negotiation, manufacture, and delivery of planes. As one Air Force official explained:

This whole thing is based on the principle of programming for the complete requirement for the aircraft or the major item along with all of the supporting equipment that goes with it at one time rather than asking for partial funding of the second, third, and fourth year increments to complete the whole end item (p. 1515, hearings).

The reason given by the Air Force for the amount of carryover funds is that in the last few years there have been changes in our force structure as well as changes in the aircraft programs. It is true, of course, that at the beginning of the Korean war when we were leading into a large planned build-up, it was natural that great sums of money would have to be made available for obligation, and certainly it is no part of the intention of Congress that this money should be spent in any given fiscal year regardless of efficient and economical planning. What is disturbing, however, in addition to the amount of the carryover funds, is that fact that the accuracy of the estimates is open to question. The Department apparently feels that through its arrangements with the Bureau of the Budget, various fiscal devices, and reports to the Congress on reprogramming, it has control over this situation. But many of the subcommittee members consider that much more work needs to be done in improving the formulation of the budget and its understandable presentation to the Congress. We have been told that the Department is trying to reduce its unobligated balances to a reasonable minimum figure, and certainly this is an effort which many Members will approve and watch in an attitude of continuing investigation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman is performing a real service in demonstrating these figures. I call his attention to the fact that Mr. McNeil, the chief financial officer of the Department of Defense, stated to us that \$4 billion was sufficient in unobligated carryover, and here the figures we are presenting call for almost \$6.5 billion.

Mr. DEANE. I agree with the gentleman from New York and appreciate his contribution. I realize that Congress and the committee established some years ago no-year funding operations. It was considered wise.

At the same time, the lead time on most items it would seem to me is not sufficient to the point where we must year by year continue to show these enormous carryovers.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] who preceded me expressed his feelings, which I share. We can criticize procurement, we can criticize various functions, but unless we begin really to know the significance of the enormous unobligated carryovers, we do not, I believe, fully understand the real problem that we face, and we will never effect savings until the defense budget is presented on a more realistic basis.

Mr. Chairman, during our hearings considerable discussion was directed toward the large amount of defense dollars expected to remain unobligated at the end of fiscal year 1956.

As indicated previously, my remarks have been directed to the Air Force budget. However, the problem of unobligated dollars is not unique to the Air Force. The other military departments also expect to end the coming fiscal year with rather large unobligated balances. While I shall address my remarks specifically to the Air Force budget, what I have to say applies to each of the services.

The amount of the carryover has reached a point that it demands serious consideration. Although the Department reports progress in reducing these balances, your committee is seriously concerned over maintaining its control over the amounts granted, the purposes for which these funds are to be spent, and in general to protect the constitutional responsibility of Congress to control the purse strings. The problem was put squarely to the subcommittee members by the chairman, Mr. MAHON:

I think that some of the new members of the subcommittee will be shocked, as I am shocked, over the continued tremendous unexpended funds available to the Department of Defense, and the tremendous sums which are not being obligated from year to year, and which funds it is proposed will not be obligated during the fiscal year 1956.

I hope that the new members will read and study carefully pages 16-21, and if they can bring a fresh outlook to this very perplexing and difficult question we would welcome it. (P. 17, hearings on Department of Defense Appropriations for 1956.)

To give you some idea of the seriousness of this problem of unobligated dollars, I will insert at this point in the RECORD a table giving an analysis of the unobligated funds brought forward, fiscal years 1951-57 which is illustrated by this chart.

On pages 4 and 5 of the committee report you will note a table giving the unobligated carryover. The difference indicated in the figures as given is that my tabulation includes amounts for military public works which was not considered in the course of our hearings on the bill. The totals indicated in the following

table were furnished me by the Defense officials:

*Department of Defense budgets—Analysis: Unobligated funds brought forward, fiscal years 1951–57*

(In millions of dollars)

Fiscal year	Total direct congressional appropriations	Total	Unobligated funds brought forward <sup>1</sup>		
			Army	Navy	Air Force
Into 1951 (actual).....	\$48,087	\$805	\$118	\$426	\$261
Into 1952 (actual).....	61,411	3,451	1,895	499	1,057
Into 1953 (actual).....	49,198	7,085	2,599	1,000	3,396
Into 1954 (actual).....	34,554	9,369	2,803	1,306	5,260
Into 1955 (actual).....	29,583	15,707	6,240	2,325	7,042
Into 1956 (estimate).....	32,233	11,535	4,122	2,491	4,894
Into 1957 (estimate) <sup>2</sup> .....		6,493	1,700	1,138	3,655

<sup>1</sup> Unobligated funds for OSD and interservice activities were as follows: Fiscal year 1954, less than \$500,000; fiscal year 1955, \$100 million; fiscal year 1956 (estimate), \$28 million.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes potential unobligated balance of proposed fiscal year 1956 military public-works appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I now insert two tables prepared by our staff on the amounts available for obligation and amounts available for expenditure.

We will at the proper time see that the figures are reconciled.

*Amounts available for obligation (all amounts exclude public works funds)*

1. Estimated unobligated portion of unexpended balances of prior appropriations on hand beginning of fiscal 1956 (July 1, 1955).....	\$10,462,000,000
2. New obligating authority in the pending bill.....	31,460,000,000
Subtotal.....	41,922,000,000
3. Add estimated net reimbursements and transfers which are a source of obligating authority.....	1,159,000,000
4. Total estimated amount to be available for obligation in 1956.....	43,081,000,000
5. Estimated obligations in 1956 (estimated by Department at \$37,348,000,000, less cut of \$744,609,000 made by committee in the budget which probably will reduce obligations by about that much).....	36,603,391,000
6. Approximate unobligated amount remaining at end of fiscal 1956.....	6,477,609,000

*Amounts available for expenditure (all amounts are exclusive of public works funds)*

1. Estimated unexpended balance of prior appropriations on hand at beginning of fiscal 1956 (July 1, 1955).....	\$43,162,000,000
a. Unobligated—	\$10,462,000,000
b. Obligated—	\$32,700,000,000
2. New funds proposed under the pending bill.....	31,499,000,000
	74,661,000,000
3. Minor transfer adjustments (p. 6 of report)....	—16,000,000

*Amounts available for obligation (all amounts exclude public works funds)—Continued*

4. Total estimated to be available for expenditure in 1956.....	\$74,645,000,000
5. Estimated expenditures (Department estimate which varies from budget. This will be reduced by unknown amount as result of committee cuts).....	33,353,000,000
6. Approximate unexpended funds to be on hand at end of fiscal 1956.....	41,292,000,000

As indicated by the chart, these large unobligated balances first became a serious factor during the military buildup June 1950 to December 1953 which followed the Communist attack on South Korea.

#### LONGER LEAD-TIME MILITARY PROGRAMS

Mr. Chairman, the Congress has accepted within recent years the wise policy of appropriating for longer lead-time military programs. For example, the Congress in previous years and your committee is recommending in this budget the total dollars not only to cover the full cost of the aircraft but also the many other component parts like engines, instruments, electronics, armaments, and so forth. Included in this budget are the dollars for initial spare parts for the airplanes to fill the supply line. The recommended budget includes the ground handling equipment and special tools and test equipment required for the maintenance and operation. It includes future and as yet undetermined engineering changes. Our budget includes the transportation of material from the manufacturers to the first receiving point in the Air Force supply system.

#### DIFFERENT LEAD-TIMES

Mr. Chairman, the various parts of the aircraft procurement program have different lead-times. For example, air frames may have to be ordered 18 to 30 months before the desired delivery date.

Other items, such as wheels and brakes, would not be ordered more than 5 to 8 months before delivery date.

Aircraft tires may not have to be ordered more than 2 to 3 months before the complete airplane delivery date.

Other initial spare parts need not be ordered until after the completed airplane is delivered.

The obligation of funds for engineering changes usually is spread out during the entire production span, as much as 2 or even 3 years beyond the budget year.

Thus it is obvious that the obligation of aircraft dollars for first destination transportation will be spread out over an even longer period of time.

#### APPROPRIATING ON SO-CALLED NO-YEAR BASIS

It is obvious from what I have pointed out that it is not in the interest of the Air Force or the Government to obligate dollars for these shorter lead-time items any earlier than necessary. To do so would incur unnecessary risk of loss due to advancing technology and required changes in a given program.

It is good business operation to delay financial commitments to the latest

point without interfering with the effective execution of a program.

This brings me to a discussion of the so-called no-year appropriations. During our hearings and in previous years the Defense Appropriations Committee has made plain to the military services that it is not the desire of the House that funds be obligated before the end of a fiscal year simply to reduce the unobligated balances. To encourage prudent obligation of defense dollars the Congress in 1948 adopted the policy of appropriating for Air Force long lead-time procurement items the so-called no-year basis. That is, authority to obligate these funds beyond a regular budget year.

That means, Mr. Chairman, that the end of the budget year 1955 the Air Force will have accumulated unobligated funds of approximately \$7,042,000,000. For the total Defense Establishment the accumulated unobligated funds brought forward will total approximately \$15,707,000,000.

All funds appropriated to the Air Force for aircraft, major procurement, other than aircraft, military construction, and research and development are available until expended by the Air Force or rescinded by the Congress.

This program, Mr. Chairman, has made it possible to plan procurement in an orderly fashion without the year-in buying rush that previously occurred because of the fear of losing funds unless they were obligated by June 30 of each year.

Under these circumstances, your committee recognizes the fact that a considerable number of budget dollars appropriated to the Military Department for fiscal year 1956 will remain unobligated at the end of the fiscal year so long as the Congress follows the policy of fully authorizing each annual military program.

It is the opinion of your committee that the policy we have been following and as contemplated in the 1956 defense budget is sound.

#### ADVANTAGE NO-YEAR FUNDING

By fully authorizing the annual military programs, your committee and the Congress is in a much better position to review the programs as a whole and determine their total cost before they are authorized. It assures the Congress that it will not be faced with a series of partially completed projects undertaken on the basis of partial financing by a previous Congress and which now require substantial additional financing if the original investment is not to be lost. It assures, for example, that we will not end up with aircraft lacking essential fire-control equipment, aircraft carriers lacking catapults, military barracks lacking heating equipment, and so forth. I think it fair to say that the foresight of the Congress in insisting upon fully financing all programs at the time they are initially approved has greatly improved the management of the military programs and saved the taxpayer substantial sums of money even though, on the face of it, the books show substantial carryovers of unobligated funds.



OTHER PROCUREMENT PROBLEMS INVOLVING  
UNOBLIGATED CARRYOVERS

In addition to these factors which require what may be called a planned carryover of unobligated funds from year to year, we must expect from long experience that some procurement actions planned for the coming fiscal year inevitably will be delayed to the next fiscal year. Unexpected difficulties may arise in contract negotiations which may delay the final signing of the contract until after the end of the fiscal year. Since the amount of such a contract cannot be legally recorded as an obligation until the contract has been fully executed, it will show up in the unobligated balance at the end of the fiscal year even though for all practical purposes the purchase has been made.

Another cause of delay in the obligation of funds is the difficulty of accurately estimating the time required to complete research and development of the more complicated items of equipment. In this regard it is important to keep in mind that science and technology in the military areas are still moving forward at a very rapid pace. If this Nation is to keep its lead in airpower the products of our research and development efforts must be integrated into our forces at the earliest practicable time. This means that the Air Force procurement program, as reflected in its budget, will always include some items still in the research and development stage. Since, as I have said, it is virtually impossible to estimate accurately the date such items will be ready for production, some delays in the procurement program from this source must be expected and some funds planned for obligation in fiscal year 1956 will no doubt remain unobligated at the end of that fiscal year. Yet we dare not risk delaying the introduction of advanced equipments into our Air Force because of a lack of funds for their procurement. Some allowance for such delays in the program must be made in arriving at realistic estimates of obligations.

## HOW UNOBLIGATED CARRYOVERS ARE APPLIED

Mr. Chairman, I need not remind the House that all funds remaining unobligated at the end of the coming fiscal year in excess of those needed to complete fiscal year 1956 programs can and will be applied against the requirements of the next fiscal year. Even so, we do not want to appropriate for the coming fiscal year any funds beyond those required for the successful accomplishment of the programs and missions of the Department of Defense. We must, however, recognize the special problems involved in the longer lead-time military programs, such as major procurement, construction, and research and development, which require, for any particular fiscal year, the availability of the funds beyond what is actually expected to be obligated in that year. We have made every effort in the bill now before you to keep these unobligated balances within reasonable limits and I am happy to report that the unobligated balances in the accounts of all three military departments, which totaled \$15.7 billion at the beginning of fiscal year 1955, are being

rapidly reduced and by the end of fiscal year 1956 will be approaching a normal level of planned carryover, about \$6.5 billion, excluding the potential unobligated balance of proposed fiscal year 1956 military public works appropriations.

## SOFT SPOTS IN THE AIR FORCE BUDGET

You can be assured, Mr. Chairman, that your Air Force panel carefully reviewed every program of the Air Force from the most expensive secret operation to paper napkins.

While the total defense budget reductions amount to only \$744,609,000, of which \$381,774,000 is attributable to the Air Force, your committee is satisfied that soft spots still remain in the Air Force budget. We could have made further reductions. On the other hand, we would share with the officials of the Department of the Air Force the responsibility of the recommended appropriations. At the same time, the Appropriations Committee will set in motion several top level investigations of Air Force establishments so that the taxpayer is given value received for the budget dollar; and to the end that the 1957 budget requests be drastically reduced.

Constantly throughout the hearings, your committee probed for the soft spots. I invite your attention to the testimony of Mr. Roger Lewis, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force—Materiel—beginning on page 583 on procurement policies and procedures.

In passing, I feel I express the sentiment of our entire Air Force panel in commending Secretary Lewis on his grasp of procurement problems and his demonstrated ability in dealing with perhaps the most difficult program of the Air Force.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I include as a part of my statement testimony of Secretary Lewis on possible savings in procurement:

Mr. DEANE. I suppose that any appropriating committee would ask, as it began to mark up a bill, Where are the soft spots?

## POSSIBLE SAVINGS IN PROCUREMENT

If you were sitting on this side of the table, where would you consider the soft spots in the procurement program where reasonable sums of money could be saved?

Mr. LEWIS. I know quite a little about this budget request. We had it in preparation for several months, and during the preparation of the justifications we had a number of discussions with the Secretary of Defense on this question, and I believe that with respect to the accounts in which I am interested—the materiel accounts—that you could not reduce this budget anywhere without changing the program.

I feel that it has run right down as of this day to the very least that we should have, and retain the integrity of this program.

Mr. DEANE. The only way in which you feel money can be saved is for the Air Materiel Command to ride herd on these contracts, and the only savings which you feel can be accomplished would be in the letting and in the checking and auditing of the contracts which you let?

Mr. LEWIS. I believe that, sir. It is a matter of doing a better job, and a good job of buying the program which we propose, rather than changing the program.

I also know that things will happen in maybe 6 months or 8 months from now, and that there may be some soft spots turn up which might cause us to change our mind,

but, as of this moment, I believe this is a good program.

Mr. DEANE. I believe that is all, Mr. WHITTEN.

## THE PROCUREMENT PROGRAM

Of the expected Air Force expenditures for the fiscal year 1956 of approximately \$15,600,000, the sum of \$8,202,000, which represents 52.6 percent of the Air Force budget will be for Air Force procurement. Since close to 53 percent of the Air Force budget goes for procurement and knowing that 80 percent of procurement contracts are placed on a negotiated basis, here is where great savings can be made.

At times committee members felt frustrated as they tried to seek full and complete information from Air Force witnesses who are mainly responsible for the budget estimates and not necessarily operational officers who have little if anything to do in the budget preparation as was the case this year. I want the record to show, however, that many operational Air Force witnesses did a creditable job, but any weak link lowers morale all along the line.

INFORMATION CONCERNING AIRCRAFT COMPANIES  
CONTRACTING WITH THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. Chairman, during the debate on this bill yesterday the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], our chairman, outlined during the debate some unusual profits being shown by certain aircraft companies who are receiving heavy defense contracts.

I submit for the record a series of questions directed to Mr. Roger Lewis, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force—Materiel—concerning aircraft companies contracting with the Government and the answers as given by Mr. Lewis beginning on page 651 of the Air Force hearings.

The information not only indicates the key companies, the principal items supplied to the Air Force, but the total sales, profits, and the dividend record for a period of years. One table gives a comparison of Government and contractor investment. Another table reveals the dollar volume of business during the fiscal year and compares the dollar volume of sales to the Government and to commercial interests.

REASONABLENESS OF PROFITS OF AIRCRAFT  
INDUSTRY

Mr. DEANE. Perhaps I am mistaken, but there is a general feeling abroad that maybe the aviation industry, dealing in Government contracts, is making tremendous sums of money, but from the figures which you gave to Mr. WHITTEN, or which were read off here a moment ago, and from your experience in the industry prior to your connection with the Government, do you consider that an unreasonable profit?

Mr. LEWIS. I do not consider the return on sales, sir, from 1945 to 1953, during which period I have the records of all of these companies, and which indicate that the average in 1953 ran 2.5 percent of sales, I do not consider that unreasonable. In 1954 this will, of course, be higher, as a result of the termination of the excess-profits tax.

Mr. DEANE. Would you be in a position to know approximately what the profit has been of these companies engaged in Government contracts, the list of which has been read to the committee?

Mr. LEWIS. This is on Government contracts that I am talking about.

# INFORMATION CONCERNING AIRCRAFT COMPANIES CONTRACTING WITH THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. DEANE. I wonder if you would provide for the record—and you indicate there are about 12 companies manufacturing the airframes, and the other major items such as engines, communication equipment, fire-control systems, and what other items are involved?

Mr. LEWIS. Well, our big companies which serve us primarily are, of course, the airframe people, fire control, engine, the instruments, and bombing system materials. There are perhaps 20 companies altogether.

Mr. DEANE. I wonder if you would provide for the record a list of these manufacturers, and what they manufacture, and in keeping with security, the type of contract which they have been awarded, and the total dollar volume involved?

I think Mr. WHITTEN asked whether or not they were Government-owned, or to what extent the Government has financed the plant with Government facilities?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DEANE. Then, you should have a final column indicating approximately, as near as you can by furnishing the profit which they have made on these contracts, and select a fairly comparable period of time, 1951 or 1952, when the Air Force began to move out separately, because I really feel that the eyes

of Congress are certainly pointed to that particular branch of the service, because the Air Force is receiving the lion's share of the defense dollar.

Would you be able to furnish that information?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes, indeed.

I would like to say one thing which I did not make clear in my discussion with Mr. Whitten, which is of great importance to us, and that is the dividend policy which these companies follow. Actually, they have been following a very conservative dividend policy. They have been taking these earnings and plowing them back into plant and facilities with which to do further Government work, and I think that the question of earnings cannot be separated from dividend policy.

I would like to tell you what the dividend policies are for these years, with your permission.

Mr. DEANE. Of course, on that score, they could come in and declare a whale of a dividend.

Mr. LEWIS. We have made it clear that we expect them to continue to follow conservative dividend policies.

Mr. DEANE. Would you show also something about the capitalization of these plants? Do you have that information?

Mr. LEWIS. We can show you that information as to their net worth.

(The information is as follows:)

"The following tables set forth the following information:

"1. Table 1 comprises a list of 18 representative Air Force contractors with a brief description of the principal items they supply and the principal types of contracts employed by the Air Force for the procurement of the items.

"2. Table 2 sets forth for the same companies listed in table 1, the total net sales for the years 1950 to the latest year available, profit for the year before and after taxes, net worth at the end of the latest fiscal year available, and cash dividends per share expressed as a percentage of earnings per share as published in financial reporting services. This last item is offered as being indicative of the past dividend policies of the contractors involved.

"3. Table 3 furnishes information with respect to Government and contractor investments in the various plants in which they operate.

"4. Table 4 sets forth a tabulation of Government and commercial sales volume for 1953. In response to requests by Air Force personnel most of the companies also furnished a breakdown of current backlog between Government and commercial."

TABLE 1

Name of company	Principal items supplied to the Air Force <sup>1</sup>	Types of contracts used in percent of dollars
<b>AIRFRAMES</b>		
Boeing Airplane Co.....	B-47; B-52; KC-97; KC-135; missiles.....	FPI 88.5, CPFF 10.7, FP 0.6, FPR 0.2, commercial.
Douglas.....	B and RB-66, B-47.....	CPFF 40, FPI 37.9, FPR 2.8, other 19.3.
General Dynamics Convair division.....	F-102; B-58; T-29; C-131; missiles.....	CPFF 54.5, FPI 37.3, FP 8.2.
Lockheed Aircraft Corp.....	C-121; C-130; B-47; T-33; F-104.....	FPI 45.6, CPFF 27.8, FPR 5.2, CPFF 4.1, commercial.
North American Aviation.....	F-100; F-86; T-28; missiles.....	FPI 89.7, CPFF 6.9, FPR 1.9, FPI 1.4.
Northrop Aircraft Co.....	F-89; missiles.....	FPR 81.5, CPFF 13.3, FPI 3.8, miscellaneous.
<b>ENGINES; ELECTRONICS; FIRE-CONTROL SYSTEMS AND INSTRUMENTS</b>		
United Aircraft Corp., Pratt & Whitney division.....	Engines.....	FPI 93.7, FPR 3.0, FP 2.4, CPFF 0.9.
General Motors Corp., Allison division.....	do.....	FPR 98.9, CPFF 0.75, FP 0.35.
Curtiss Wright Corp.....	do.....	FPR 100.
General Electric Corp., aircraft gas-turbine division.....	do.....	FPI 89, CPFF 11.
Westinghouse.....	Magnetrons, radar, aircraft electrical systems.....	FPR 61.2, FP 32.3, CPFF 6.5.
Radio Corporation of America.....	Ground radar; communication equipment; navigational equipment; fire-control systems; missiles, etc.	FPR 93, FP 6.4, CPFF 0.6.
Bendix.....	Motor generators; electronic equipment; wheels and brakes; pumps; instruments, gyros, etc.	FPR 62.5, FP 33.2, CPFF 4.1.
Kearfoot.....	Compass systems; synchros, bearings.....	FP 81.9, FPR 15.2, CPFF 2.9.
Kollsman Instrument.....	Air-speed indicators, machometers, tachometers, sextants, etc.	FP 62.5, FPR 37.4, CPFF 0.01.
AVCO.....	Fire-control system; engines, radar navigational equipment.	FPR 84.5, FP 12.3, CPFF 3.2.
Sperry Corp.....	Bombing navigation computer; autopilot; radar; gyros..	FPR 93.1, CPFF 4.5, FP 2.4.

<sup>1</sup> The items listed are not in any special order and are not all-inclusive.

NOTE.—CPFF, cost plus fixed fee; CPIF, cost plus incentive fee; FP, firm fixed

price; FPR, fixed price subject to redetermination at stated intervals or upon completion; FPI, fixed-price incentive.

TABLE 2.—Total sales, profits, and dividends of selected Air Force contractors<sup>1</sup>

(In thousands of dollars)

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954		1950	1951	1952	1953	1954
Boeing Airplane Co.: <sup>2</sup>						Consolidated Vulture—Con.					
Sales.....	\$307,251	\$337,301	\$739,010	\$918,246	\$1,003,176	Dividends paid as a percent of net earnings per share.....	24.2	42.7	50.1	58.7	( <sup>3</sup> )
Net profit before taxes.....	\$24,227	\$19,841	\$49,784	\$58,818	\$76,726	Net worth.....				\$52,420	
Net profit after taxes.....	\$10,827	\$7,141	\$14,084	\$20,318	\$36,976	Lockheed Aircraft: <sup>4</sup>					
Dividends paid as percentage of earnings per share <sup>1</sup> .....	30.0	45.5	30.8	28.0	( <sup>4</sup> )	Sales.....	\$173,330	\$237,229	\$438,122	\$820,466	\$732,872
Net worth at Dec. 31, 1954.....					\$109,432	Net operating income.....	\$14,106	\$6,329	\$17,321	\$48,057	\$45,846
Douglas Aircraft: <sup>5</sup>						Dividends paid as percent of net earnings per share <sup>1</sup> .....	46.4	43.1	30.2	32.5	( <sup>4</sup> )
Sales.....	\$128,893	\$225,173	\$522,619	\$874,515	\$915,217	Net worth at Dec. 31, 1954.....				\$88,837	
Net profit before taxes.....	\$13,214	\$18,597	\$33,631	\$61,534	\$79,991	North American Aviation: <sup>6</sup>					
Net profit after taxes.....	\$7,214	\$6,713	\$10,792	\$18,586	\$36,157	Sales.....	\$143,032	\$177,675	\$315,217	\$634,688	\$645,821
Dividends paid as percent of net earnings per share <sup>1</sup> .....	52.1	60.8	41.7	42.0	( <sup>4</sup> )	Profits before taxes.....	\$13,626	\$15,222	\$20,321	\$40,073	\$52,480
Net worth at Dec. 31, 1954.....					\$120,890	Profits after taxes.....	\$8,086	\$6,422	\$7,821	\$12,773	\$22,180
Consolidated Vultee <sup>6</sup> (merged with General Dynamics on Apr. 30, 1954):						Dividends paid as percent of net earnings per share <sup>1</sup> .....	53.2	66.8	54.8	40.3	
Sales.....	\$255,860	\$322,157	\$390,997	\$370,703	( <sup>4</sup> )	Net worth at Sept. 30, 1954.....					\$77,795
Operating profit before taxes.....	\$9,853	\$11,849	\$18,196	\$12,279	( <sup>4</sup> )						
Net profit after taxes.....	\$10,241	\$7,750	\$10,426	\$10,254	( <sup>4</sup> )						

See footnotes at end of table.



TABLE 2.—Total sales, profits, and dividends of selected Air Force contractors<sup>1</sup>—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954		1950	1951	1952	1953	1954
Northrop Aircraft: <sup>2</sup>						Radio Corporation of America: <sup>2,3</sup>					
Sales.....	\$43,876	\$89,694	\$187,161	\$184,221	( <sup>4</sup> )	Net sales and operating revenues.....	\$584,425	\$596,769	\$690,641	\$848,887	( <sup>4</sup> )
Net operating income.....	( <sup>4</sup> )	( <sup>4</sup> )	\$7,770	\$7,634	( <sup>4</sup> )	Operating profit.....	\$96,394	\$62,142	\$67,223	\$72,900	( <sup>4</sup> )
Net income after taxes.....	—\$44,974	\$3,276	\$2,420	\$3,360	( <sup>4</sup> )	Net income after taxes.....	\$46,249	\$31,192	\$32,325	\$35,021	( <sup>4</sup> )
Dividends paid as percent of net earnings per share <sup>5</sup> .....	None	None	23.7	18.7	( <sup>4</sup> )	Dividends paid per share as percent of net earnings per share.....	48.2	49.5	47.6	45.2	( <sup>4</sup> )
Net worth at July 31, 1953.....				\$12,429	( <sup>4</sup> )	Net worth Dec. 31, 1953.....				\$215,719	( <sup>4</sup> )
Republic Aviation: <sup>2</sup>						General Motors: <sup>2,3</sup>					
Sales.....	\$57,713	\$130,441	\$412,235	\$411,811	\$323,456	Net sales.....	\$7,531,086	\$7,465,554	\$7,549,154	\$10,027,985	( <sup>4</sup> )
Profit before taxes.....	\$4,615	\$8,083	\$27,396	\$27,514	\$18,592	Net income available for dividends.....	\$834,044	\$506,199	\$558,721	\$598,119	( <sup>4</sup> )
Profit after taxes.....	\$2,355	\$2,935	\$8,096	\$8,314	\$8,976	Percent of income disbursed or accrued.....	64.6	71.7	64.8	60.5	-----
Dividends paid as percent of earnings per share <sup>5</sup> .....	21.4	34.2	15.6	19.9	( <sup>4</sup> )	Bendix Aviation: <sup>2,3</sup>					
Net worth at Dec. 31, 1954.....					\$52,140	Operating profit before taxes.....	\$219,419	\$340,540	\$508,701	\$635,544	( <sup>4</sup> )
United Aircraft Corp. <sup>2</sup>						Net income after taxes.....	\$27,695	\$30,690	\$50,730	\$62,915	( <sup>4</sup> )
Sales.....	\$269,255	\$417,212	\$667,769	\$817,557	\$654,295	Dividends paid per share on common stock as percent of net earnings per share.....	\$16,954	\$11,818	\$15,295	\$17,352	( <sup>4</sup> )
Profits before taxes.....	\$25,798	\$31,257	\$51,419	\$69,702	\$53,377	Net worth at Dec. 31, 1953.....	59.3	80.6	41.5	45.7	( <sup>4</sup> )
Profits after taxes.....	\$13,204	\$14,267	\$17,809	\$21,194	\$25,996	Kearfott Co. Inc. <sup>2,3</sup>				\$128,241	( <sup>4</sup> )
Dividends paid as percent of net earnings per share <sup>5</sup> .....	44.8	49.3	38.6	44.1	( <sup>4</sup> )	Kollsman Instrument Corp. <sup>2,3</sup>					( <sup>4</sup> )
Net worth at Dec. 31, 1954.....					\$149,495	AVCO Manufacturing Corp. <sup>2,3</sup>					
Curtiss-Wright: <sup>2</sup>						Net sales.....	\$256,996	\$286,598	\$326,585	\$414,783	( <sup>4</sup> )
Sales.....	\$135,663	\$176,625	\$326,184	\$438,728	\$475,084	Operating profits before taxes.....	\$31,245	\$23,029	\$24,565	\$6,963	( <sup>4</sup> )
Profits before taxes.....	\$13,629	\$14,958	\$20,898	\$35,403	\$39,377	Net income after taxes.....	\$12,635	\$10,089	\$11,028	\$3,368	( <sup>4</sup> )
Profits after taxes.....	\$7,279	\$6,908	\$9,048	\$11,403	\$19,377	Dividends paid per share on common stock as percent of net earnings per share.....	34.0	54.5	50.0	85.2	( <sup>4</sup> )
Dividends paid on common stock as percent of net earnings per share <sup>5</sup> .....	163	133	58.8	44.1	( <sup>4</sup> )	Net worth at Dec. 31, 1953.....				\$94,180	( <sup>4</sup> )
Net worth at Dec. 31, 1954.....					\$136,412	Sperry: <sup>2,3</sup>					
General Electric: <sup>2,3</sup>						Net shipments.....	\$162,454	\$240,943	\$396,218	\$464,071	( <sup>4</sup> )
Sales and services.....	\$1,960,429	\$2,319,347	\$2,623,887	\$3,128,127	( <sup>4</sup> )	Operating income.....	\$19,153	\$33,448	\$51,232	\$51,447	( <sup>4</sup> )
Net earnings before taxes.....	\$346,246	\$393,710	\$387,395	\$428,627	( <sup>4</sup> )	Net income after taxes.....	\$9,588	\$10,883	\$13,930	\$15,801	( <sup>4</sup> )
Net profit.....	\$165,727	\$151,719	\$138,116	\$173,423	( <sup>4</sup> )	Dividends paid per share on common stock as percent of net earnings per share.....	42.3	37.2	29.6	39.6	( <sup>4</sup> )
Dividends paid per share as percent of net earnings per share.....	62.4	59.2	56.6	69.1	( <sup>4</sup> )	Net worth at Dec. 31, 1953.....				\$78,784	( <sup>4</sup> )
Net worth Dec. 31, 1953.....					\$932,412						
Westinghouse Electric: <sup>2,3</sup>											
Gross sales less discounts and allowances.....	\$1,091,923	\$1,246,801	\$1,454,272	\$1,582,047	( <sup>4</sup> )						
Profit from sales.....	\$153,220	\$168,271	\$169,637	\$150,770	( <sup>4</sup> )						
Net profit after taxes.....	\$77,922	\$64,578	\$68,581	\$74,322	( <sup>4</sup> )						
Dividends paid per share as percent of net earnings per share.....	37.3	49.6	47.2	44.1	( <sup>4</sup> )						
Net worth Dec. 31, 1953.....					\$788,810						

<sup>1</sup> Net profits before taxes are after depreciation.<sup>2</sup> Source: Board of Governors of Federal Reserve System, Mar. 16, 1955.<sup>3</sup> Source: Standard & Poor's Industry Surveys, Dec. 16, 1954.<sup>4</sup> Not available.<sup>5</sup> Cash dividends paid in last fiscal year were as follows: Boeing, \$9,729,000; Curtiss-Wright, \$8,891,000; Douglas, \$13,850,000; Lockheed, \$6,991,000; North American, \$9,446,000; Republic, \$2,443,000; United Aircraft, \$12,502,000. Source of information re 1954 operations of these companies is Wall Street Journal or verbal information from company officials.<sup>6</sup> Source: Moody's Industrials, 1954 edition.<sup>7</sup> Includes income-tax credits.<sup>8</sup> In view of diversified business, it is not possible, from information available, to determine the effect of Air Force business on the net sales, operating profits or dividends. Government business versus commercial, to the extent available is set forth in a separate tabulation. Dividends paid as a percent of net earnings on Air Force contracts are not possible of segregation.<sup>9</sup> Separate financial data for Allison Division not available.<sup>10</sup> Wholly owned subsidiary of General Precision Equipment Corp. No separate financial data published.<sup>11</sup> Wholly owned subsidiary of Standard Coil Products Co., Inc. No separate financial data published.

TABLE 3.—Comparison of Government and contractor investment (selected contractors)

Contractor	Plant location	Government-owned real property	Contractor-owned real property	Government investment in fixed assets at acquisition cost <sup>1</sup>	Contractor investment in fixed assets at acquisition cost <sup>2</sup>	Contractor	Plant location	Government-owned real property	Contractor-owned real property	Government investment in fixed assets at acquisition cost <sup>1</sup>	Contractor investment in fixed assets at acquisition cost <sup>2</sup>	
A. Airframes:						B. Engines:						
Boeing.....	Seattle.....	X	X	\$73,400,000	\$45,217,000	Pratt & Whitney.....	East Hartford.....		X	147,850,000	175,000,000	
Do.....	Wichita.....	X	X	101,171,000		Allison.....	Indianapolis.....	X	X	114,412,000	69,500,000	
Do.....	Larson.....	X	X	11,797,000		Wright Aero.....	Woodridge.....	X	X	184,065,000	47,625,000	
Douglas.....	Long Beach.....	X	X	43,843,000	57,503,000	General Electric.....	Evendale.....	X	X	105,052,000	65,000,000	
Do.....	Santa Monica.....	X	X			C. Electronics:						
Do.....	Tulsa.....	X	( <sup>3</sup> )	97,499,000		RCA.....	Camden.....		X	2,941,000	39,580,000	
Lockheed.....	Tucson.....	X	X	3,300,000	50,389,000	Do.....	Los Angeles.....		X	500,000	7,000,000	
	Burbank-Van Nuys.....	X	X	15,818,000		Westinghouse.....	Horsehead, N. Y.....		X	1,205,000	5,657,000	
Do.....	Marietta.....	X		96,825,000		Bendix.....	Towson, Md.....		X	787,000	9,072,000	
Do.....	Palmdale.....	X	X	5,800,000	None	D. Instruments:						
Republic.....	Farmingdale and Port Washington.....	X	X	11,217,000	13,870,000	Kearfott.....	Little Falls, N. Y.....		X	1,926,000	2,444,000	
						Kollsman.....	Elmhurst, N. Y.....		X	12,500,000	3,251,000	
North American.....	Inglewood.....		X	19,299,000	33,622,000	E. Fire control and other components:						
Do.....	Columbus.....	X	X	86,000,000		AVCO.....	Evendale and Richmond.....		X	5,878,000	3,542,000	
Do.....	Palmdale.....	X	X	4,835,000		Sperry.....	Long Island.....		X	191,000	23,611,000	
Convair.....	San Diego.....		( <sup>3</sup> )	22,577,000	27,889,000	Total.....				1,272,593,000	687,950,000	
Do.....	Fort Worth.....	X	X	72,427,000								
Do.....	Palmdale.....	X	X	2,500,000								
Northrup.....	Hawthorne.....	X	X	22,978,000	8,007,000							
Do.....	Palmdale.....	X	X	4,000,000	None							

<sup>1</sup> Government-owned plant valuations are based upon actual or estimated original costs plus land and buildings or improvements added since World War II.<sup>2</sup> The information contained in column 6 was obtained from contractors' latest financial statements available to the Air Force as of March 15, 1955. Where brackets

are shown in column 6, the figure represents the total contractor investment in fixed assets at acquisition cost without regard to location.

<sup>3</sup> Leased.<sup>4</sup> Government investment limited to personal property only.

TABLE 4.—Dollar volume of business during contractors' fiscal year 1953

Company	Total dollar volume of sales during calendar year 1953 <sup>1</sup>		Percent of current backlog <sup>1</sup>	
	Government	Commercial	Government	Commercial
	Millions	Millions		
Boeing	2,917	0.9	100	0
Consolidated Vultee	307	64	99.6	.4
Douglas	770	105	81	19
Lockheed	755	65	83	17
North American	623	11	98.7	1.3
Northrop	184	0	100	0
United Aircraft—Pratt & Whitney Division	434	79.7	98.4	1.6
General Motors—Allison Division	430	32.4	93	7
Curtiss-Wright—Wright-Aeronautical Division	303	48.6	92.3	7.7
General Electric—AGT Division	553	0	100	0
Radio Corp. of America	168	673	20	80
Westinghouse	391	1,173	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )
Bendix	505	152.7	72	28
Kearfott	40	1	98.1	1.8
Kollsman	30	2.3	97	2.95
AVCO	200	214.7	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )
Sperry	250	10.9	99.06	.94

<sup>1</sup> This information was supplied by the contractors involved. The Government versus commercial backlog figures represent current backlog as of approximately Mar. 15, 1955, in all cases except Westinghouse and AVCO. The percentages of current backlog are not necessarily equivalent to the division of sales between Government and commercial in 1953. The sales reported by company divisions will differ in some cases from total sales for 1953 as set forth in table 2.

<sup>2</sup> 9-month figure.

<sup>3</sup> Refused to furnish.

<sup>4</sup> \$187,920,000.

<sup>5</sup> Not available.

#### NATURE OF OWNERSHIP AND COMPETITION IN AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY

Mr. DEANE. Is there any indication that some shrewd dealers—there seem to be some around who can move in and take over a great railroad—but are there any undercurrents indicating that there are individuals who are trying to capture the industry, or is it pretty independently managed, plant by plant? Are there interlocking directors, or other factors, which would lead you to feel that it is monopolistic?

Mr. LEWIS. I do not feel that it is monopolistic.

To answer your first question, it has been reported from time to time that consideration was being given by certain groups to take certain companies over, as in the case of the railroads, which you mentioned. However, I have not seen that done in any case. I feel that that has not happened, and that the companies are widely held by the public, and managed by permanent managements.

On the second question, as to whether or not the industry is monopolistic, I do not think it is. They go through a period, such as during the Korean buildup, where everyone has about all the work they can handle, and they sort of quit being at each other's throats, but the minute that competitors

start to work in the industry, as they have already started to work, they compete very bitterly and, while they cannot compete on contracts as such because we cannot buy off the shelf, they are very competitive in trying to keep their labor rates down, their overhead rates down, to keep their man-hours per pound of airplane down, and other measures of efficiency which are well known to us and well known in the industry. They fight very hard to maintain an independent and competitive position.

I do not think there is any monopolistic tendency in the industry at all.

#### MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS

A significant operation which impressed me during the hearings to which the Air Force can point with pride involves maintenance and operations.

Mr. Chairman, as a part of my statement I will include at this point a table indicating the percentage changes in various programs involving maintenance and operations from the end of fiscal year 1952 until the end of fiscal year 1955. During this debate I refer you to the chart exhibited here reflecting what will appear in the RECORD on maintenance and operation:

Percentage changes in various programs from fiscal year 1952 as compared with changes in the "Maintenance and operations" appropriation

End of fiscal year	On board (military persons)	Percent increase (+) or decrease (—)	Total actual flying hours (thousands)	Percent increase (+) or decrease (—)	Active A/C	Percent increase (+) or decrease (—)	Wings	Percent increase (+) or decrease (—)	Appropriation (bill)	Percent increase (+) or decrease (—)
1952.....	973,474	-----	7,105	-----	15,264	-----	95	-----	3,443	-----
1953.....	977,593	+1	8,178	+15	17,074	+12	106	+12	3,201	-7
1954.....	947,918	-3	8,104	+14	18,827	+23	115	+21	3,146	-9
1955 <sup>1</sup> .....	970,000	-1	9,468	+33	19,713	+29	121	+27	3,493	+1

<sup>1</sup> Budget strength, end fiscal year 1955.

This chart reflects the percentage changes indicated in the above table. At zero, end fiscal year 1952, on the chart, the number of on board Air Force military personnel totaled 973,474. Follow the yellow line. At the end of fiscal year 1955 the number of on board military

personnel will total 970,000, a decrease of 1 percent for the period.

The black line represents appropriations. The total dollar increase for maintenance and operations from the end of fiscal year 1952 to the end of fiscal year 1955 is only 1 percent.

These lines on total military personnel indicating a 1 percent decrease at the end of fiscal year 1955 as compared with the end of fiscal year 1952, and with only a 1 percent increase in appropriations for the same period of time, is highly significant when you consider the goals that have been reached. These goals are represented by these lines on the chart.

For the same period, you will note the green curve representing wings, which shows an increase of 27 percent.

For the same period, total active aircraft has increased by 29 percent.

For the same period, from the end of fiscal year 1952 to the end of fiscal year 1955, total flying hours have increased by 33 percent.

This chart, I feel, Mr. Chairman, graphically reveals that we are receiving from the Air Force a rapid and commendable increase in firepower involving only a negligible increase in appropriations and at the same time the military personnel for the period has decreased by 1 percent.

#### PROJECTED MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS FOR 1956

The budget for maintenance and operations during fiscal year 1956, recommended in our bill, totals \$3,615,500, an increase of \$112,708. This will be a negligible increase in total appropriations for maintenance and operations when you consider that the flying wings are scheduled to increase by 10, from 121 to 131.

Twenty-five principal installations will be added.

Eighty-three new aircraft control and warning installations will be set in operation.

Fuel and oil costs will increase by approximately 20 percent, due largely as a result of more high fuel consumption from jet flying hours.

#### RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Another phase of the Department's work that will require continuous review is that concerned with research and development. The cost of new weapons, the rapidity of scientific advance, and the time to produce new equipment after it has been developed, all these factors combine to create the problem of dividing money between improving the weapons we have and engaging in research and development on the newest possible devices.

We have to peg this situation somewhere; if we concentrate on new weapons to the exclusion of present equipment, we might be too much in the blueprint stage if a war should come; if we do not keep up with technological advances, we might have to fight a war with old-style weapons. The balance between what we have now and what we can have in the future will always be changing, and it is inevitable that any decision will bear the marks of a compromise. The difficulty in this area is clearly highlighted by any advances that may be made in producing an intercontinental ballistic missile. Until such a missile exists we must depend upon fighter interceptor planes and other presently available methods of blunting



an enemy attack. And we must insure that we shall be in the forefront of any revolutionary development of this kind.

My colleague on the subcommittee [Mr. WHITTEN] made a contribution toward the statement of this problem when he asked:

If you have an immediate war in sight, it opens up the possibility of going all out for the very best, but if I be right in my conclusion that the major problem or one of the major problems is the economic shock on the Nation of spending this much over a 15-year or 20-year period annually, I come back to the question as to how often you should switch from one class or quantity of airplanes to a new class, which is better, at the expense of junking all you had (p. 212 of the hearings).

To this Assistant Secretary Roger Lewis replied: "Well, I think you have asked, really, the question which is the heart of this entire military problem."

The committee has recommended \$570 million for research and development, the amount of the budget request. A portion of this sum has been transferred from other Air Force funds, with the net result that there is a real increase of approximately \$8 million over the amount available in 1955.

I think that all the members were glad to observe that the research and development programs of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force were being better coordinated in the Department of Defense than had been the case heretofore. The committee has been assured that our research and development program "is oriented toward the capability of fighting an atomic war and also being prepared to fight a nonatomic war."

#### AIR FORCE CAREER PERSONNEL

Although we may talk of planes, bases, and weapons in strengthening our defense forces, we all know that our career personnel is the most essential factor in building an Air Force. Planes require pilots, bases require maintenance, and weapons cannot be used without skilled training. In the last year or two the appropriations as well as the policy committees have given increased attention to insuring that the armed services are made more attractive as a career. This is a problem that requires good administration as well as appropriations, and the subcommittee noted with approval the fact that the Air Force officials are pursuing a variety of approaches looking toward the solution, or at least the mitigation, of many of the situations which have been interfering with reenlistments by our trained men. The ability of the Air Force to man a 137-wing force with 975,000 men is based upon a calculation that these will be trained men. If the Air Force has to deal with a high percentage of trainees over a long period of time, not only will the personnel ceiling figures have to be changed, but the entire operation will increase the cost by millions of dollars.

The problem requires that all concerned should move out on a broad front to take care of such matters as pay and allowances, inducements to enlist and to reenlist, medical and dental care for dependents, movements from one situation to another, education of dependents in foreign countries, equalization of ben-

efits between Regular and Reserve personnel, improved survivor benefits, and adequate housing. The solution of these and other personnel problems is essential to the success of maintaining an Air Force whose trained personnel has been finding many superior attractions in private industry.

#### CAREER INCENTIVE ACT OF 1955

The recommended appropriations for fiscal 1956 includes provision for increased pay of military personnel under the Career Incentive Act of 1955, in the amount of \$730,011,000. This sum, of course, covers all three of the armed services. The committee considers that adequate funds have been made available to cover pay and allowances of men who are on extended active duty, the movement of household effects for men who have permanent changes of station, subsistence allowances for aviation cadets and enlisted personnel, and travel allowances.

#### AIR FORCE RESERVE

With particular reference to our air strength buildup, it should be noted that \$43,563,000 has been recommended for Air Force Reserve personnel and Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps students to cover pay, allowances, travel, subsistence, and other necessities. This amount represents an increase of \$15,563,000 over fiscal year 1955.

#### AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The Air National Guard has been recommended for an amount of \$202,841,000, which will enable it to expand and modernize its setup. This appropriation covers all the Air National Guard expenses except the procurement of aircraft, and is \$42,841,000 more than the 1955 figure. There is a decrease of \$300,000 under the budget estimate, but this is because the price of aviation gasoline is not expected to be as high as originally anticipated.

#### MEDICAL FACILITIES

Funds made available to the Air Force during fiscal 1956 will cover an expansion of medical facilities both within the United States and overseas. They will also cover expenses of our personnel in areas where regular Air Force facilities are not available.

#### HOUSING

Both the Department and the subcommittee recognize the problems involved in the shortage of housing. This is a problem not only in the United States but also in foreign countries where we have bases. Housing shortages on or near a base can impair the combat effectiveness of our defensive air forces. In an all-out emergency it would take too long for some of our airmen to get from their homes to their planes.

Some of the subcommittee members have personally investigated the Air Force housing situation in Europe and elsewhere and have found many of the families living in substandard dwellings. Some improvement is being made. It is a most difficult problem. By June 1956 we expect a marked improvement, in view of new plans and policies as contemplated by this budget.

Last August and September I visited France and Germany and advised with

General Hoge and General Tunner, who gave me an excellent firsthand insight into overseas housing for our servicemen. I have pictures of the situation that exists on some of our bases, particularly those which have trailer camps. Neither the Department officials nor the committee members are satisfied with these inadequate housing conditions. The guaranteed housing program ran into trouble because French interests did not wish to build in extremely rural areas unless they had a 7-year instead of a 5-year guaranteed program. I think we could have had suitable housing in France and saved millions in trailers if the guaranty period had been increased earlier. Neither the housing problems in Europe and Africa nor those in the United States can be solved merely by the appropriation of money. We must come to grips with all aspects of this situation, and it is going to require much more coordinated effort than has been put into it in the past. If we are asked to project our planning on a long-term basis so that we can stabilize our Military Establishment, it naturally follows that housing must also be thought of on a long-term rather than a trailer basis.

To provide standard housing for the military in most any area is not easy, and especially in overseas establishments. I commend Assistant Secretary of Defense Franklin G. Floete on his recent decision which will on certain French applications increase the rental-guaranty period from 5 to 7 years. It is indeed a most difficult problem. In Germany the housing problem is not so acute. By June 1956 we can hope that a marked improvement in military housing will have taken place in France.

One of the significant provisions in the appropriations bill for fiscal 1956 is contained in section 635, which permits the use of rental-allowance funds for the leasing of quarters constructed under the rental-guaranty program in foreign countries. Where such quarters are available, the Department will now have authority to see that they are used in preference to substandard dwellings that might be occupied on a rental-allowance basis.

#### FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that the Secretary of the Air Force and all those associated with him, both civilian and military, in the administering of the Air Force budget, feel the tremendous responsibility as they contemplate the fact they are receiving almost 50 percent of the defense dollar. To that end, one of the questions that members of the committee had in mind continuously during our hearings was: "Are we seeing evidence of Air Force management by honest and capable people making a real effort to achieve economies of operation?" In large organizations, it is always possible to find inefficiencies, and I am sure this is true in the Air Force as in any other operation of similar or even lesser magnitude, be it governmental or commercial. However, I am convinced, and I am confident that I speak for the whole Air Force Subcommittee,

that there is in the Air Force a gratifying consciousness of the need for economy, and evidence of steadily improving procedures to obtain maximum utilization of resources. Undoubtedly, the increasingly careful review each year by the subcommittee, of the request for new obligational authority, is having its effect, as are some of the subcommittee's specific inquiries into certain practices. But it must be acknowledged, also, that the civilian leadership in the Air Force is of high quality, appears to be well informed, and gives indications of genuine effort toward economical and business-like operation. I have found evidence, too, that the military in the Air Force do support this effort, and, in fact, have continued to initiate many management improvements.

Speaking almost a year ago of the existing civilian-military relationship, a high-ranking Air Force general said:

A review of the working relationships established in the Department of the Air Force reveals an intimacy and cordiality which lead to ready exchange of ideas, frankness of discussion, and currency of information which would be next to impossible in any organization which included the insulation of top echelons.

I believe the relationship described is essential to effective management, and I am heartily glad to find it exists in the Air Force at this time.

It may be noted that there was reassuring testimony before the subcommittee on various methods used to keep the secretarial level in more intimate contact with the daily problems in all operating areas, including materiel, manpower and personnel, research, financial management, and military construction. It was stated, and I believe it to be borne out in the experience of the Air Force, that the two additional Assistant Secretaries approved by the last Congress for each of the three services has done much to make civilian management more of an actuality.

We think of the Air Force as a young service, recalling that it commenced its separate identity less than 10 years ago. Although it does not have as many senior officers with over 30 years service as the Army and Navy, this could hardly be expected in view of the small number of officers in the Air Corps in 1925 when it was part of the Army. Furthermore, it is my personal opinion that most of the officers I have met who have been selected and promoted for positions of command in the Air Force need yield to officers of no other service in alertness, aggressiveness, general competency, and desire to meet the challenge of the job. These are mighty important qualifications for the managers of a defense force today.

I am by fairness constrained to tell this body that much specific evidence is found in the testimony, of efforts to achieve economies of operation in the Air Force. Progress in financial management techniques is marked in the current fiscal year by the achievement of the first summary reports of the dollar values of inventories at bases and depots in this country and overseas. This will make possible far better control over stock levels and needed pro-

curements than was practicable on an item basis, where over 1 million Air Force items are involved. Progress is also marked this year by production from the Air Force accounting system of the first consolidated financial report. The foreword to this historic publication said in part:

In order to meet the internal requirements of the Air Force for essential and effective financial control, together with the external requirements imposed by Congress, the Air Force has embarked upon the development of a financial-management system. It is expected that an integrated accounting system will produce for management at all levels reliable financial data which will enable operating and financial executives to better control and manage Air Force personnel, cash and physical resources. \* \* \* This financial report, reflecting data as at September 30, 1954, represents the first consolidation of USAF worldwide costs of assets, liabilities, and operations ever prepared.

As indicated the monetary inventory accounting reports and the financial reports are embraced in what the Air Force calls its financial management system. The fundamental point in regard to this which should be encouraging to this body is the support given to financial management by the military itself. From the letter which General Twining sent to the major Air Force commands on the financial management system, I quote the following:

Although our main purpose in life is the development and employment of air power, we know we will have to realize those aims within the framework of limited manpower and dollar availability. One of the means to help us endure the long pull economically, as well as militarily, is financial management.

At another place in the letter of the Chief of Staff also said, and I quote:

Air Force operations have become so complex that the modern air force commander and supervisor must be provided with the least volume and greatest simplicity of data. Financial information developed and interpreted in the financial management system is expected to be one of the primary sources of meaningful and significant guidance for management actions.

As in the case of the other services, the Air Force submitted a number of examples of actual economies achieved in such fields as procurement-contract audits, personnel requirement reductions, procurement cutbacks, and maintenance-cost decreases. These are contained in the record of the hearings before the subcommittee and therefore I need not add them to my remarks at this time.

I would like to conclude this portion of my remarks by saying that our inquiries have satisfied me as to the ability and the will of the top Air Force management, both civilian and military, to continue striving for the economies that we, as representatives of the taxpayers, must demand of them.

#### AIRLIFT OF ENGINES

The Air Force is responsible for providing appropriate support for our overseas forces in accomplishing our mission. This embodies the movement of large amounts of expensive supplies and equipment in order that they will be

readily available in event of war. We are striving to fulfill this responsibility in the most efficient and effective manner.

Careful consideration was given to prestocking many of these varied items; however, it was found to be unacceptable because: First, the total stockpile cost would be astronomical; second, storage costs, plus constant in-storage maintenance of these items, would be excessive; and third, losses due to obsolescence would be beyond reason. The vulnerability of such overseas stockpiles of these high-cost items also influences Air Force decision.

The choice of how to support this overseas requirement was narrowed to the most feasible answer, which is to expedite by air movement the high-cost items and to prestock overseas only those bulk supplies whose nature and cost do not justify the expeditious air movement.

Fortunately, for these high-cost items, air movement is not all added expense. The incremental additional cost of this rapid transportation will be repaid by reductions in the procurement of the high-cost items. Accordingly, stockpiles in this country and overseas can be drastically reduced. Of course, where possible, expedited surface transport will be substituted for airlift, and the services of both the railroads and the trucks will continue to be used within the United States as they fit in the system.

On examination of the most expensive items in our inventories, the Air Force found that aircraft engines are of such high cost that this air-movement plan would so significantly reduce stockpiles and pipeline requirements that engine procurement could be materially curtailed. Spare-engine requirements for fiscal year 1956 were reduced 40 percent with the introduction of this airlift system for the engines. Based on this engine-airlift concept, we anticipate that future requirements for new spare engine procurement will continue to be about 40 percent less than would otherwise be required to support Air Force plans under prior concepts for the movement and control of our aircraft engine stocks.

Last fall, in connection with this type of airlift, the Air Force conducted a survey which revealed that of the Air Force cargo airlifted 85 percent comprised high-value items, such as aircraft parts, electronic equipment, photographic supplies, and machine tools and equipment. Since January of this year the Air Force, using organic military aircraft, has airlifted aircraft engines and approximately 8,300 tons of aircraft parts, electronic equipment, machine tools, and other high-value items. This high-value cargo was delivered to the Air Force commands in Europe, North Africa, Alaska, the Far East, the Northeast Arctic area, and the Caribbean.

Since the results have been so favorable, we decided to expand this operation, and, accordingly, contracts to use three commercial carriers have been approved. We believe that by the end of this fiscal year our day-to-day working relationships with the carriers will solve the minor operating difficulties



pertaining to scheduling, routing, handling, and so forth. This experience in the coming months will afford us the opportunity of more thoroughly understanding how this airlift can be fully implemented. Therefore, in light of the attendant economies of this airlift system and the predominant consideration of the need for this type of movement to support our wartime tasks, we are asking the Congress to approve the program as contained in the Air Force budget for fiscal year 1956.

#### CONCLUSION

The original budget estimate for the Department of Defense was \$32,232,815,000, and after a thorough evaluation was made of the various programs upon which this request was based, the committee recommended \$31,488,206,000. This amount represents a reduction of \$744,609,000, but it is considered entirely adequate for the efficient management of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and various interservice activities. We realize, however, that it is based upon the assumption that there will be no serious decline in the international situation. If at any time during the coming fiscal year storm warnings should threaten the preservation of peace, we have been assured that the Department of Defense will ask for funds to expand the military program.

It is only upon the basis of this understanding that the defense appropriations are correlated with the planned military manpower cuts. This was one of the main issues that came before the committee, and it is significant that some of the key witnesses were dubious about the cuts, while some of the committee members were vigorously in opposition to reducing the size of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. In line with the emphasis on airpower, the Air Force was increased by 5,000 men, as I have already pointed out.

Another reason that affected the final committee decision was the assurance of the Department of Defense that Reserve forces would be trained and would be prepared to augment our regular troops in time of war. As the committee reported:

The Reserve programs appear never to have been properly administered or coordinated to provide an effective military force in time of emergency. It is hoped that something positive, both in the forms of needed legislation and better administration, will be done during the ensuing fiscal year.

There are some of us who consider that it is a risk to cut the regular forces before the Reserves are militarily prepared, and we hope that this risk has been so calculated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as not to be out of line with the unfolding events of the future.

A roundup of the most significant committee decisions embodied in the military budget reveals the concern of the members with the problem of continuing congressional control over the purse strings. This involves the harmonizing of policy, program, and the budget lest the final result be impaired by falling between these three stools. To achieve a better balance between these interacting elements, it will be essential

that improvements be made in the budgetary process and in the manner in which the budget is presented to the Congress. Specifically, as the committee report states:

The committee has become increasingly annoyed over the disparities, inconsistencies, and apparent contradictions between the budget document and financial reports of the Department of Defense. \* \* \* The annual budget document appears to adjust the amounts recorded in prescribed accounts in such manner as to make it extremely difficult for the committee to recognize what purports to be the same financial data periodically received from the Department.

In order to ensure that budgeting and accounting are put on the same basis, the committee has directed that present practices be modified before the fiscal 1957 budget is submitted to the Congress.

In addition, the committee has asked that more adequate estimates be made of carryover funds for fiscal 1957. Although some unobligated balances are necessary, it does not seem that such a large discrepancy in estimates should occur as in 1954-55, when the original estimate of \$6.8 billion ultimately turned out to be more than \$13.6 billion.

It would appear from the testimony that different officials who are engaged in formulating the budget have different ideas as to how long this process takes. If we are trying to relate policy, program, and budget, it is essential to know whether the budget is based upon a recent policy or one that was uppermost some 2 years ago. It is only by dovetailing these factors in a shorter space of time that we can hope to keep up with the present and be prepared in the future.

Detailed chronologies of the budget are necessary if we are to pin down this process so that we can see just who is responsible at any given time.

The committee has several methods for maintaining a continuing control over the expenditure of funds. One method is to insist upon reports in areas where the hearings have revealed that supervision is necessary. For example, in the reprogramming of funds which really represents a diversion of funds from the original purpose for which justified, the committee has asked the Defense officials to keep faith with the committee and Congress, and to continue making requests for prior approval of changes, and in addition to submit detailed reports on all reprogramming of funds twice a year.

Another method is to reduce funds if the Department does not carry out congressional intent on a given problem. For example, in the matter of inducing reenlistments, it would appear that more could be done by administrative action. Men could be given jobs for which they are qualified and not required to make frequent changes in their permanent stations. The committee has made a 5-percent reduction in funds for travel and the moving of household goods, and has notified the Department that unless there is substantial improvement, by the time hearings are held on the 1957 budget, the committee will consider placing a specific limitation on this type of expenditure.

Another control device is to establish criteria whereby economies may be effected, and the committee has done this in the case of the procurement process.

Investigations are still another way the committee has of discharging its responsibility to control expenditures. An investigation is scheduled for the problem we have just been discussing—frequent changes of station and lack of proper job placements. Then, too, on the problem of procuring spares and spare parts:

The committee will, between now and January 1956, conduct an investigation \* \* \* so that it may be informed as to controls involving both purchase and issuance and current funding procedures.

In addition to committee investigations, of course, field inspection trips are made by individual members, and this is one of the most valuable ways of checking, not only on how the money is being spent for operating programs, but of learning on the spot the local problems that we might otherwise never hear of in Washington.

The evaluation of the budget requests in such a manner as to promote the national defense is indeed a responsibility that is not confined to the hearing process—the committee members consider that it is a continuing duty throughout the year.

In closing, I want to pay my respects to the many men and women in the armed services—military and civilian—who are working hard to establish and maintain the high standards so essential to the success of our Defense Establishment.

Mr. Chairman, throughout these hearings I was impressed with the fact that because of research and development a weapon, a device, a program was practically obsolete by the time it reaches operation because of more modern techniques, weapon improvements and revised programs.

It impresses upon me this thought—that we must find a superior answer to greater and greater defense budgets.

Mr. Chairman, I note with interest and approval the favorable reaction of the President for a meeting with Russia. We must use every means at our command to find an answer to this ever-increasing budget for national defense.

#### THE BATTLE OF IDEAS

While I am a strong believer in a sound program of national defense, as we have attempted to spell out in this budget, I do feel we must not stop here.

We live in a day when the struggle is for the wills of men and nations.

We must not only have a gun in our hands but a superior idea in our heads and an answer in our hearts if we stem the tide of a foreign ideology that has captured one-fourth of the land area of the world and hold within their grasp approximately one-third of all the people in the world.

There came to my desk within recent days a provoking newssheet edited by Moral Rearmament which I think has a significant application to the problem before us of trying to use every means at our command to win in this battle of ideas. I was struck with the question raised: "How does an idea capture the

world? The answer: By capturing the wills of individuals. When an idea wins the allegiance of the wills of men it becomes a force in history; it becomes an ideology."

Is there an alternative force? What idea will capture the allegiance of the wills of men and of nations?

My discussion up to this point has involved policies and programs of the Defense Establishment and how to relate policy and programs to the end that we have an adequate Military Establishment.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that we must implement this enormous expenditure of dollars to build a great national defense with a superior idea to communism. We must breathe into this budget ideas that will change men and nations. You can kill a man but you cannot shoot an idea. The idea will either rise to bless or to plague you. Thus, Mr. Chairman, I would urge that all of us responsible for the Defense Establishment, the Congress, the military and civilian personnel, bring to our thinking, acting, and living absolute moral standards as the only way by which we can find an answer to greater and greater national defense budgets.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When will I get a chance to ask my question?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is in no position to give an answer to the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that it is impossible to get recognition in the Committee, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In view of the fact that it is impossible for anyone except members of the committee to get time to speak, and I have no fault to find with that, and it will probably be impossible to get time under the 5-minute rule because the committee will use that, I will have to make a point of order, because I want the Members of the House to hear the members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise; and on that motion I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. MAHON and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH.

The Committee divided; and there were—ayes 3, noes 101.

So the Committee refused to rise.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum is present.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I shall be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan at this point if he desires to propound a question.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The gentleman from Michigan suggests there is more than one Member from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I make the point that there are so many gentlemen from Michigan on the Republican side I do not know which one is referred to.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. There are a number, I am sure, but I was referring specifically to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I had two questions, one I wanted to ask of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] and the other of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE]. I will wait until they get the floor again. I do not want to put upon the gentleman from Wisconsin the responsibility of answering questions that were put to them.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I feel in a rather embarrassing position when my recognition was the occasion for a motion that the Committee rise and then other Members felt somewhat disappointed, I am sure, to learn that they were called back in here for a teller vote just prior to my allotted time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The Members who came in to answer will be well repaid by what the gentleman has to say, I have not the slightest doubt.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, serving on the Air Force panel this year has been an interesting experience for me. It is the first time that I have had the responsibility of sitting through the details of a request for appropriations by one branch of the armed services, even though for the past 4 years it has been my responsibility to deal with one particular phase of military operations, that of installations, the public works program of the armed services.

One of the things that impressed me considerably and caused no small amount of concern was the actual lack of congressional control over funds that are made available to the Armed Forces. Included in this budget for the Air Force—and I am going to devote my comments entirely to the Air Force although some of the things which I may say, I am sure, will apply to the other services as well—are seven broad categories: Aircraft and related program, about \$6 billion; major procurement other than aircraft, about \$350 million; research and development, \$570 million; military personnel, \$3,670,000,000; Reserves, about \$43,500,000; National Guard, about \$200 million; maintenance and operation, about \$3,600,000,000-plus.

The thing that is of considerable concern to me is that the Congress, once it provides a particular number of dollars for any 1 of these 7 categories, loses control of that money from that time on. We lose control of it not only affirmatively but we lose control of it negatively as well. By losing control of it affirmatively I mean that we cannot impose our will on any branch of the armed services to be sure they will use any particular amount of money for any particular purpose.

That is true because of the control of the actual allotment of the funds which has been assumed over the course of the years by the executive branch of the Government. In other words, when we appropriate \$570 million, we will say, for research and development, we have no assurance that that \$570 million will be actually and affirmatively used by the Air Force for that purpose, because, actually, the Bureau of the Budget has assumed the authority to allot it, to dole it out, to the Air Force during the course of the year.

Just as we cannot affirmatively control the money that is to be used for a single purpose, we are somewhat helpless as a matter of practice in the negative sense as well, because within those large categories of millions and billions there is at least under the law complete transferability within that huge amount of money. So, once the lump sum has been appropriated, even though they may come up with high stacks of justifications to show so many millions for projects in the category they call 200 or in the group of projects in the category 300 or 400, as a matter of fact, they can switch that money around within that amount and completely at their discretion if, of course, they can get the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, also within the executive branch, to make those transfers.

In one case, for instance, we found \$150 million that had been obligated in the course of a fiscal year that was in excess of the amount justified for that purpose the year before. When we asked about it, the answer was, "Oh, we simply transferred it from another place where we did not need it quite so badly."

One thing that grew out of the development of that situation has been a commitment that in future years, when major transfers of that kind are made, the Appropriations Committee will be informed at the time that transfer is contemplated. At least that is a step forward. I do not think it represents anything like a complete answer to these lump-sum appropriations and the complete transferability within them, but, while all of the Members of Congress will not be informed, at least the responsible Appropriations Subcommittee will be informed when these transfers are being made. I think it is quite plain, then, that we are almost completely dependent upon the good judgment and the managerial capacity of the people in the executive departments for the efficiency as well as for the strength, the actual strength, of the defense forces of this country. Yes; we can exercise our judgment in making these lump-sum appropriations, but once that has been done, the real progress that must be made, that affects directly the defense of our country, within the executive department. That is true specifically with respect to this procurement program that we heard a considerable amount about. Those few who were on the floor most of the afternoon yesterday, at least, heard a great deal about the procurement program, where a large proportion of the appropriations for the Department of Defense is channeled. I am not in a position as a newcomer to this



particular specific appropriation to defend the procurement policies of the Air Force. Heaven knows that all of us have found occasions to be critical of procurement policies in all branches of the armed services. But, there was one thing that concerned me a bit about the considerable discussion on this point that took place here yesterday on the floor, and that was the impression that could be received by those who listened, by those who read the *RECORD* this morning, that as far as the Members of the House were concerned, we were willing to cover the whole procurement program with a blanket indictment. I do not believe that was intended; in fact, I know it was not intended by any of the members of the subcommittee who spoke on that subject. But, there were questions asked and comments made by other Members that left, for those through the *RECORD* this morning, a general impression of such an indictment. I am personally satisfied that there has been such a great improvement in the procurement policies of the Air Force and the other branches of the services in the past 2 years; there has been such a great improvement that the darkness has given way to a gleam of light in that direction, that made it seem particularly unfair that the comments of indictment of the procurement program should be made at this particular time.

There has been great improvement, in my opinion, not only in our procurement processes, but in the overall management of the Air Force as well. In the field of manpower, for instance, when in late 1952 the program contemplated 143 wings, with 1,185,000 men in uniform and another 440,000-plus civilian employees, in the 1956 program it is contemplated that we shall have by the end of that fiscal year 137 wings with 975,000 men in uniform and 330,000 in a civilian capacity. That is a net reduction of 322,000 persons, with a reduction of only 6 wings in the total contemplated target for the Air Force.

Not all of the credit for this improvement in manpower management or utilization goes to the Air Force. The committees of the Congress and the Congress as a whole have been responsible for insisting upon better utilization of that manpower.

So, too, in the field of financial management. The creation of industrial funds and stock funds, so that we now can have a dollar inventory control comparable to the kind of control exercised by private business, represents a great advancement in that field.

One thing occurred to me in the course of our hearings, and that was almost a reticence with which we were told about these great improvements in everyday management of the Air Force and of the other branches of the service. Finally, toward the close of the hearings, when we asked for specific examples, we were presented with a mimeographed list of specific things that had been done in the way of improvement. I do not intend to take the time here or to expand the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* with it, but I think some of the critics ought to know of the kind of daily management improvement

that has taken place within the Armed Forces in the last couple of years.

I was glad that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE], who preceded me on the floor, took the occasion to point to some of the encouraging factors that have appeared in this all-important field of improved management. And that has filtered down—this insistence upon better day-to-day management—has filtered down to the base level, to the installations of the Department of Defense. There is, as my colleague from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] pointed out yesterday, an economy consciousness, in my opinion, at the installations that was not present in past years. As I say, I cannot take that entirely from my own experience on this subcommittee, but I can base it on the observations that I have made while serving on another subcommittee which had occasion to visit some of these installations.

To get back to this problem of procurement and the improvement in management that has taken place in it, I think that it can fairly be said that the presentation on this subject made by the people of the military was not effective. They did not do the job they could have done of impressing the members of the committee and the Congress as a whole with the improvements that have been made. But certainly, as my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] pointed out, Mr. Lewis, the Assistant Secretary for Materiel, gave what I considered a most encouraging demonstration of a healthy approach to attempting to get a solution to the procurement difficulties.

I am glad that a study is to be made before next year's hearings under the sponsorship of the Committee on Appropriations, which is completely proper. But it does concern me a bit that from some of the comments that were made yesterday, the indication was that we all feel that the program has sort of deteriorated, bogged down, and that the job of the investigating committee will be to go in and tear it to pieces and lay the pieces separately on the table for the Members of the Congress and the public to study.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the chairman of our subcommittee.

Mr. MAHON. I feel the gentleman is making a very interesting and valuable statement.

I feel that many improvements have been made in the Department of Defense over the years. I think the Department with every passing month is gaining some in cost consciousness and in efficiency, especially since we have leveled off on a stable program. The further we get away from a crash program I believe the more solid that program will be.

I deplore the attitude of anyone who would undertake to paint with a broad brush and destroy the confidence of the people in the good intentions and in the efficiency of our civilian and military leaders. By and large, I have faith and confidence in them. The tendency which existed a few years ago of branding so many of them as either uninformed, or disloyal, or stupid, was very

bad, indeed, for everybody. Talk about breaking down morale in the Armed Forces, that is a good way to do it. We have some good men, and they are trying to do a good job.

I recognize that in some of the statements I made yesterday I might have appeared on the surface to be somewhat harsh, but my object was to try to drive home this fact, that we must somehow, thinking not as Democrats or Republicans but as Americans, find a way to get more for the defense dollar in procurement. While I have indicted our failures through the years under previous administrations and now, I recognize that it is hard to get the competitive bidding that we want, at times impossible.

We have only one firm, I believe, making the intercontinental B-52 bomber. Often you do not have a lot of people who are in a position to bid. We have only about 12 companies that have Air Force contracting facilities for air frames. I recognize that many of these contracts have to be negotiated. It is because so many of them have to be negotiated that we really need the top-flight men doing the negotiating, because men of less caliber can do the competitive bid basis type of work.

I join with the gentleman in undertaking to put in proper focus this highly important and significant facet of our defense building.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman did make those comments. It is in keeping with his constructive approach to these problems. My purpose has been simply to attempt to correct the overall impression of indictment that could be gained from yesterday's discussions, an impression which was neither completely justified nor fair. I am sure from what the gentleman from Texas has said and from his very consistent conduct in that respect that he will certainly join in the hope that whatever investigations result will not be with the purpose of creating headlines. I am sure that will not be true because of the sponsorship of this particular investigation, but will be to help the executive branch and the Congress meet their joint responsibility in this great field. I cannot help but feel that some of the difficulties we have had in procurement must be brought right home to roost at the steps of the Congress itself. We ourselves have been responsible to no little extent for the fact that we do not have complete competitive bidding in many fields of the procurement for the Department of Defense.

Some of the same gentlemen who were critical of the procurement program yesterday, for instance, were some of those who have been quite pointed in some of the remarks they have made that some defense contracts ought to go into particular hardship areas of this country, regardless of what the additional expense to the Defense Department might be. Too, they have urged that small businesses be considered in place of a large business that might be able to do the job more cheaply.

There is an overriding policy consideration in this respect that transcends the dollars and cents of the broad com-

petitive-bidding program, but that is the responsibility of Congress, it is not the responsibility of the Air Force. Likewise, in the maintenance of alternate sources for large procurement contracts, we in Congress have insisted upon that.

The Department of Defense has insisted upon that at the very top level, also, because we and they felt it was not completely safe to put all our eggs in one basket for any important source of procurement. In that connection, the gentleman from Texas mentioned the alternate sources of B-52 procurement. The second one costs considerably more than the first one, and we could get all of them cheaper probably if we continued to get all of the planes from the one place. But because of overriding policy considerations, we have said to get them from that second place also even though we have to pay more for them. Those are some of the things that enter into the matter both in the field of policy and in the field, shall I say, of congressional interference which have made it impossible for the Air Force to go ahead with most procurement on a completely competitive basis. We know, too, in this field where secrecy is involved, and where we are not dealing with common items, but items which have to be not only manufactured but started from scratch and where we have to go through all the processes of research and development before we get the items, you cannot, therefore, go out and put that on the bidding market and let everybody compete for contracts. It is not too surprising that we must have a large amount of our procurement on something other than a straight competitive basis. I make these comments not as a champion or defender of past procurement policies, but rather to attempt to bring some of these things into focus. In my opinion, they have been taken out of focus somewhat by the discussion had here on the floor yesterday.

There are a couple of other things that I did want to mention. One of them was the Air Force ROTC program. I imagine that a good many of you have had inquiries and letters relating to about 1,300 young men who took the Air Force ROTC program at various colleges and universities throughout the country. They then found at the end of the course, when they were qualified in every respect, that the Air Force Reserve commission which they thought they were going to get, simply was not available to them. About 4,800 of such ROTC graduates were not given Reserve commissions. They were given the alternative of volunteering in a noncommissioned status, letting Uncle Sam catch up with them through the Selective Service, or taking a commission in the Air National Guard. A number of them took this last alternative, but they found after taking that course that such service was not credited even though they went on duty with the guard for a period of 3 years—that was not credited as service in the Armed Forces. They were still subject to the Selective Service once they resumed status other than active with the Air National Guard. Those 1,300 young men presented something of a problem and in the course of our hearings, it was

brought out that legislation is now being submitted by the Department of Defense. I do not know exactly what its status is with respect to the Committee on Armed Services of the House but the legislation is "in the works," to use a slang phrase, to attempt to solve that problem so that they will be credited as long as they have gone on active duty and have worn the uniform, actually, in service, at least as far as the Selective Service Act is concerned.

There is one more item that I want to deal with briefly. It is something for which no funds are included in this appropriation measure. But, it is something for which the Congress has made considerable appropriations in the past, and that is the tactical air-navigation program which, in its abbreviated form, is called TACAN. At about the time our hearings were in progress, a number of newspaper articles and editorials began to appear, inferring a considerable amount of duplication and waste of money through the development of TACAN by the Armed Services at the same time the civilian program, generally referred to as VOR/DME, was being developed by the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Because of these questions the chairman very prudently brought the head of the communications for the Air Force, General Blake, before us to ask him about some of the items and editorials which had appeared. What has developed since our hearings have been held is this: that the Air Navigation Development Board's recommendation that VOR, as it is called, which is the direction-finding part of the aircraft navigation system, should continue until 1965, but they were going to cut off what they call the distance measuring part of it, DME, on July 1, 1955. They said they could not assure to the civil aircraft participants that DME would be usable beyond that time. As a result of the furor that was raised at about the time our hearings were completed, a revised plan has been submitted, which means that this DME, the one that was the most controversial at the time, has been extended until 1960. So that as far as I know, with but a few minor exceptions, this arrangement has made both the civilian aircraft people and the Department of Defense as satisfied as any compromise seems to satisfy the participants in any controversy. I have some other factual material on this subject, furnished to me by Assistant Secretary of Defense Donald A. Quarles, who serves as Chairman of the Air Navigation Development Board, at my request, which I shall ask to insert in the RECORD at this point at the proper time.

#### BACKGROUND AND ORIGINAL PLAN OF ACTION

The Air Navigation Development Board's plan of action, as announced on February 8, 1955, provided for the continuation of distance measuring equipment on an experimental basis only. Further, no service was guaranteed after the 30th of June 1955. The reasons for this provision were:

Civil distance measuring equipment and the tactical air navigation system—TACAN—used, in part, the same fre-

quency space. This prevented full implementation of TACAN.

The DME program was not complete as far as ground installations were concerned; 447 ground stations were planned to be completed by June 30, 1955, with an additional 55 planned for 1956. Two hundred and sixty-one of these are to be fully commissioned by June 30, 1955.

Information available to the Board indicated that there were less than 200 nongovernment aircraft equipped with airborne distance measuring equipment. This represented a very small segment of the aviation public. For example, 28,000 VOR sets had been purchased by civil aircraft operators; 26,000 VOR sets have been purchased by the Navy and Air Force.

Because the Board had stated TACAN as its objective, it seemed logical to shut down distance measuring equipment immediately. This would prevent further expenditure of public funds and inconvenience the least possible number of airborne equipment purchasers.

The Board's policy did not require the elimination of distance measuring equipment immediately. On the contrary, it provided for the DME ground network to be held in a state of readiness because of the possibility of TACAN failing to measure up to common system standards. This possibility, although remote, nevertheless existed and required that a backup, or insurance measure, be provided. It was, therefore, planned that the present civil DME in combination with an omnibearing system, yet to be developed, which would satisfy both the civil and military—common system—requirements, would comprise this backup system. Civil DME in combination with the new omnibearing device is popularly known as the alternative system.

#### MODIFIED DME PLAN

Soon after the original ANDB plan had been announced, a definite trend against the discontinuance of DME became evident. Accordingly, it seemed prudent to modify the plan as originally announced where it pertained to discontinuing DME. The change would attempt to satisfy those who wanted DME service by offering a continuation of the DME ground network operation until June 30, 1960. This plan would not interfere with the partial implementation of TACAN already ordered for use by the military and as long as it was clearly understood that this extension was not to encourage the entrenchment of the distance measuring equipment, the ANDB had no objection to it. With these understandings, the ANDB agreed that DME service could be extended, although it was pointed out that the military and the scheduled air transport industry had no plans for it.

The Air Coordinating Committee, by separate action, has recognized and supported the ANDB modified plan of action as announced in its press release of April 20.

Extending DME has many advantages; among the important ones are:

It permits DME service to be given to those requiring it.



It enables both air crews and ground traffic control personnel to become familiar with the use of distance information and to develop and adopt procedures which will increase air traffic control efficiency. These procedures would be applicable to TACAN or subsequent systems having a distance measuring component.

It maintains the DME ground network in readiness to be teamed with the new omnibearing system in event TACAN, for reasons not foreseen, fails to qualify for common system use.

#### SUMMATION

The Air Navigation Development Board's agreement to extend the life of the distance measuring equipment was partly in response to a desire expressed for this service by a persistent segment of aviation and also because the Board felt it had no right to deny a useful navigation service to those equipped to use it, if it did not interfere with the adoption of the system that had been found best for all users of the airspace.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], a member of the committee.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Are we to sit here and just loaf and wait for these expositions that we are supposed to listen to?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the Member in charge of the time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Flood and Mr. Whitten have been on the floor constantly for 2 days.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten]. By prearrangement he was to close the debate, but another speaker to whom I intended to yield is not present. So the gentleman from Mississippi was to close the debate on the Democratic side. He is a very valuable member of the subcommittee and has been waiting to be heard.

I now yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the recognition given me by the membership when I was yielded this time to discuss this more than \$30 billion appropriation.

On this particular matter I am pleased to have a chance to discuss with the membership some things that I think are very important.

I served on the national defense appropriations during World War II, on the Navy Subcommittee. At that time we had a number of developments that showed what could happen and what was happening in any program we had.

For instance, we found that the Navy had entered into a contract with the Standard Oil Company of California to develop Elk Hills where the Navy had a bigger percentage of the land but the contract gave the Standard Oil Co. a far bigger share of the oil. The contract gave to that company all the oil that was produced for the first 5 years. The

value of Navy's share of such oil was to be repaid to the Government but at a rate less than interest on the Government's share of the oil which Standard Oil received. It developed that that contract was in perpetuity. Once we got into it, it developed that there had been no approval by the Department of Justice. Upon our objections, the contract was ruled illegal, and the Secretary of the Navy said he had pulled a boner.

During my service on that subcommittee it developed that the Navy wanted to build about \$500 million worth of new facilities late in the war. We asked why it was that they did not use the Army-abandoned facilities. They said the Army had abandoned no facilities. At the lunch hour Navy witnesses came back with a statement from the Army that the Army had abandoned no facilities. But when we got into the hearings we got from Army witnesses the facts, and it was developed that while they had vacated facilities, they were not abandoned because they had caretakers there. The services had a committee on the joint use of facilities, but it had not met during the 3 years of the war. The net result of our efforts was the Navy used in excess of 200 vacated Army facilities at a saving of between \$400 million and \$500 million. But the tragedy of it was, and this is supported by the record, the Army could not tell the Navy, after they found out what was required or desired, until they got on the telephone and called over the country to find out what they had that was vacated, because they did not know here in Washington.

The reason I mention that is that it has been my view for a long time, and it is personal, that the only real way the members of the Appropriations Committee can do you any real good in this year's hearings in considering this year's justifications must be based on what we know they did with what they got last year; in other words, the knowledge that we have of last year's actions is the real basis that we have got to have if we want to do any good in checking on this year's requests. So I have always believed from the start that investigations were highly valuable. I have used it on the Subcommittee on Agriculture during the years that I have been chairman. If I had time, I could recite benefits which have come of the Department, to the Government, and to the people.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In connection with the donor property bill that I introduced and which passed this House and with which the gentleman is familiar, we had hearings. We found that in connection with stock fund items of the various branches of the Defense Department they were declared excess but not surplus. If declared surplus General Services then would have information which they could use in asking other agencies of the Government if they could use any of the items before they got down to the colleges and the universities, which is proper.

We found that even on property declared excess by the Department of the

Army, that the Department of the Navy did not know it nor did the Department of the Air Force, and some of that property could have been used and the taxpayers' money saved. Some of it has been sold to the extent of \$2,400,000,000 at a gross average return of about 7 percent.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I want to say that this whole military department is full of illustrations just like that.

But back to this investigation. I made the point repeatedly in former years that the Military Establishment, big as it is of necessity, that the only way to hold them in check is by a continuing investigation. A few years ago under the threat of the McClellan resolution to establish a joint committee on budget for the House and Senate, I got the Appropriations Committee to adopt a resolution providing for annual investigations of each department and agency of the Government by agents of the Appropriations Committee with the subcommittee pointing out the particular place for the investigation to be made. This year I went back on the Subcommittee on National Defense and notwithstanding the resolution I mention, I found that we had not had that investigation for 1953 and 1954. I began to ask questions of the departmental witnesses, what I want to recite to you are largely what they did not know. We had before us the finest group of military people to justify these appropriations. The things they discussed, however, had to do largely with new gadgets, new weapons, new equipment, military equipment which I could not hope to qualify to discuss with them. But when you got them to discussing money and the finances requested they knew as little about that as we did about the military part of it they discussed. Of course among all the witnesses there were some exceptions but by and large it was as I have described. I know somewhere they must have had people with more information.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Having served with the gentleman for quite a period of time, I know that he would not make a statement erroneously, so I would like to correct him to this degree: We have had two groups in the last 2 years of special investigators that have been assigned at the request of the respective subcommittees. Those reports are available in the committee for a Member. Perhaps the gentleman did not know that, but that is the truth about the matter.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the correction by the gentleman. Having served on this committee, my statement bears out the testimony before the particular panel on which I happened to serve, which was the Air Force. I appreciate the correction because I certainly want to be factually correct.

Let me show you what was testified in these hearings. It was testified, for instance, that the Air Force was continuing on a 150-plane contract, each of which cost millions of dollars. After only two planes had been produced, they

had a wing flutter. Instead of stopping the contract then until such defect was corrected, the Department continued the production.

When first questioned about it, one of the reasons given was that to stop further production would mean unemployment. I said, "Well, nobody wants unemployment, but that should be handled through the Unemployment Compensation Commission and elsewhere. The National Defense Department is not the department to take care of that."

It developed then they do not follow such a policy now. Now they fly before they buy. I said to them this change in policy proves the correctness of my objection to continuing this contract pending correction of the defect in the two planes delivered.

"Now," I asked, "having found it out, what is your excuse for carrying on this particular contract?" The answer was anything but adequate. It also developed in these hearings that the Air Force has requested in this bill approximately \$150,000 more per unit for a type of plane they have been procuring from the same company for 2 years. For 2 straight years the company has been making the same plane. But in this request the Air Force asked for an additional \$150,000 per unit for the planes to be built during the coming fiscal year, which are the same as those heretofore built. When I asked what effort they had made to try to get the contractors to do it at the same unit price, the answer was that they had made such efforts. I then asked that they bring the actual file in. I wanted to see the correspondence. The reply was that they had to get the file from Wright Field. Our chairman supported my request and they were told to bring in the actual file from Wright Field to show what effort they had made to get this contract on the same unit price.

After about 10 days they came back and said they were sorry they had given us erroneous information. The contract had not been negotiated. It had not taken up with the company, but, to play safe, they had estimated they would have to pay \$150,000 more per plane. I then asked if they had not only misled us but if by requesting the increased amount they had not given away their hand by saying they would be willing to pay \$150,000 more per plane?

But they insisted on showing an example of where they had saved money. Then was presented the facts concerning a certain contract when they had set a target of approximately \$400,000 cost per unit with provisions for the Government to pay 80 percent of any overage. After he had been operating they found he was a high-cost operator; then they had gone in and got a contract for two-hundred-thirty-odd planes and in such contract they scaled the cost down to \$290,000 per plane.

But, listen, it developed that when the lower price was set for the new contract they had finished only about 16 planes under the other contract, as I recall the facts, which showed it was a high-cost contract, but they did not do anything under their renegotiation rights so far as the original contract was concerned.

Here is the thing that gets you about the laxity of our whole operation and we need to correct it. I was pleased to note the statements made by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

This appropriation is in about eight different parts, so to speak. Within each of those parts they can do almost anything they want to by juggling it around and spending directly opposite to their justifications. The major part of the money, the minute we appropriate it and it comes to them the first of July, they can use it for an entirely different purpose so far as any law is concerned. Now, there is an arrangement where it is supposed to be reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget. They have assured us that they would advise us in the future of the substantial shift of the funds, but whether that is carried out or not will require a continuing check to see whether they use it for the purpose requested or in the way that they later tell us that they did use it. This actually requires two budgets: what they say they will do and then a performance budget, what they actually did. The Assistant Secretary for Air made this significant statement:

We have to have the right to use these millions of dollars that you give us for one purpose; we have to have the right to use it for a different purpose because if we cannot, we would be tempted to go ahead and use it for the purpose we got it for even though we found out it was unsound.

Now, that is the statement in the record.

And I want you to listen to this. I am talking about the appropriation process. In this bill there are millions of dollars for procurement of weapons for which drawings have not been drawn and the use of which is dependent upon a discovery of the Atomic Energy Commission which has not been discovered yet. Now, can you go any further than that in laxity in providing money to the biggest operation that you have? Now, I know these people have just as much desire to save as I do. They were wonderful people, but most of the witnesses before us were primarily fine military men and not grounded in the financial requests that they were before us to justify.

Now, the reason I point this out—and there are some things you can take comfort in in this matter—I gained the impression that our military men play up to the utmost maximum what Russia could do with what she has; and figure her to have the absolute maximum as to what she could have. Then, to play it more safe, we count for ourselves the absolute minimum that we could do under any circumstances in case of attack. So that feeling gives a wide spread for our real degree of preparedness. That is a human action, and it is a case of playing it safe; it at least gives you some confidence that perhaps we are in good shape. Personally may I say we are willing to risk these military men that were before us to fight any war we may have and we will win it. I am talking about the financial aspect. They tell us that we will have to carry this military program on for from 15 to 30 years. That means that half of your annual budget

is going to be for military defense for 15 to 30 years. We have had this situation since World War II, virtually, and you are not going to raise in taxes 50 percent of your annual expenditures. You are going to finance half of it by inflation. We have and will. Thus, it becomes imperative that we consider on the one hand the national defense that we believe we must have, but on the other hand we must match against it the economic effect of paying half of your money out each year in national defense. I sympathize with the President of these United States as he has to balance on the one hand the desire for everybody to be protected to the fullest extent, with plans to meet any possible Russian attack as though Russia could fight a war on every front at once, and against that desire the President must balance the economic effect of such tremendous expenditures on our own country in the years ahead. But, the point I make is that these very facts make it imperative that we know what the military is going to use the money for when they ask for it and that we require them to come back and show what they did use it for and that we get a dollar's worth for dollars spent. Now, the best way to save money is to have the military people themselves save it. I think by reason of these hearings and these speeches, and this investigation that we are going to have, the greatest help will be that it will make the top men call on the second men to know what they are doing and right on down the line. We need this investigation badly to help us in the Congress. The national Defense Department needs it just as badly so it will know.

One more thing and I will close. Last year we passed an act requiring the National Defense Department to report to the Congress its contractual obligations as of June 30, 1954. They were supposed to make that report by December 31, 1954. They did not make the report, they did not tell us by December 31; they did not tell us by January 31; they did not tell us by February 28; they have not told us yet. Our committee has repeatedly called for such report. We still do not have it. I am not one who would charge that failure up to arrogance of anybody in the Department of National Defense. The tragedy of the situation is that the Department of National Defense has not told the Congress almost a year after the date on which we asked for the information, because they do not have it themselves.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Did the gentleman know that there is in this bill \$400,000 for the Secretary of Defense for the purpose of giving out public information?

Mr. WHITTEN. I heard the point made by the gentleman yesterday.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman mean to tell us that it has been a year and he cannot even get this information yet?



Mr. WHITTEN. I suppose we will never get such information until the Defense Department can find out itself.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I think it would be significant to point out, that in his discussion of the procurement problem, the gentleman is somewhat supported by the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Materiel, Mr. Roger Lewis, who said:

After we have done the very best job we feel we can in placing and administering these contracts, still the very nature of the article and the times under which we are making these procurements make it possible for unusual profits to be realized.

That is in keeping with the gentleman's idea of better contracting.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman and I repeat that most of their contracts in procurement are still what anybody would call cost-plus; they dress it up in some other way, but the target is set and the major contracts provide for such and such a percentage of profit. And the test as to whether they have been paying too much is to see what has happened to the aircraft companies whose chief source of business has been the Government during that period. We got some information in the RECORD on this point. I trust our investigation will disclose more.

I trust that this investigation will be thorough. I trust it will be a continuing one, because I believe the folks who are running the Military Department are just as sincere as I am; they have the same earnest desire, but they sadly lack information. An investigation of this kind will be of help to them and of help to the Congress, and under present conditions is an absolute necessity for protecting the national interests.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, at this late hour in the day, I would hesitate to take the time of this Committee in further discussion of this measure, which has been so well explained by my colleagues of the committee on both sides of the aisle. As the last speaker on this side of the aisle I would be tempted to rest on the explanations and the masterful discussions that have been made by my colleagues, were it not for the fact that we have not gotten around to what is perhaps the big issue in this bill, as I understand it, which is the question of whether or not the committee's recommendations as to the size of the forces are to be followed, or whether they are to be amended as sought by my distinguished colleague on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Unfortunately, that gentleman is not on the floor at this moment. If he is going to abandon offering his amendments, if we may yield back the balance of our time, we could go ahead with the bill. May I ask, if I yielded back the balance of the 25 minutes that were yielded me, would my good friend, the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], move to close the debate

and proceed with reading the bill for amendment?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, under the rules of the House one must not tempt a fellow Member.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. My distinguished chairman is a most repudiated Member. He is one of the best I have served under but, as I recollect, he polled but three votes on his motion a few minutes ago that the Committee rise. I would really feel sorry for him, were it not a case of his winning by losing.

This appropriation of nearly \$31.5 billion is something like 55 percent of our taxpayers' substance for this year. Those of us that have toiled long and faithfully on it will have to inflict our thoughts upon you just a little further because, after all, on the rightness of this bill depends not only a lot of money, astronomical sums, but also our very national safety. I will try to get down to the point about why our committee has recommended the particular amount it has in this bill so far as the strength of our ground forces is concerned.

There has been some implication that there is in progress a cut in the numbers of our Army, our Navy, and our Marines. In a sense that is true, but it is nothing new. This whole thing dates back to the so-called New Look of a year ago, when it was decided that the crash buildup should cease, that we would have to level off for a long term, and keep our powder dry and our defenses in order and on a basis that we could maintain for an indefinite period.

The planners in our Defense Department find themselves in the unfortunate situation of having to be able to run either a marathon race or a 100-yard dash, whichever they are called upon to do by our potential enemies. It might seem in a matter as important as this, that the thing to do would be to give more money and have a little larger force than we think necessary, and then be very safe, but unfortunately it is not that simple.

Because the American taxpayers' dollar is fundamentally the best and the most fundamental ammunition we have, the purchasing power of the American dollar over the years must be husbanded and guarded so that our economy can support not only our defense effort but all the efforts of our great country. Therefore we can ill afford to maintain forces on any level that is not a sound level.

You have been told that our defense expenditures now have leveled off at about what they are likely to be for some years to come, or, rather, that they are expected to level off at about what they are this year, with certain exceptions. Actually, the level of about \$35 billion has been estimated. That comes about for two reasons. One is that we are living on some money from previous years, some \$2 billion in the Army, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has explained, and I think about three-quarters of a billion in the Navy. In addition, this bill does not include the military construction. But all of our experts have told us that we will level off at about the present strength, so they hope, if there is not some sharp change in the

international situation, but that we have to be prepared to maintain this level for years to come.

That makes it imperative that we do not maintain forces at an unjustified level. We should maintain them at a conservatively safe minimum and at the same time there must be balance. Thus, we cannot afford to have too many spare parts when we do not have the motors in which to put them. How do we, of the subcommittee, reach the figures? How do we ask you, Members of the Committee of the Whole and the House of Representatives, to fix the figures? It is very much like the great American jury system. We are not experts. We hear the experts. We hear what they have to say and then in our best judgment we decide what is right. In this instance, the experts, and we have had them, we have had the very finest experts, I believe, that there are in this world, they have told us what our Armed Forces should be for the coming year. They have not all agreed. We, on the subcommittee, do not all agree and, of course, the Members of this great body would not all agree. But by and large the testimony has been overwhelming as expressed by the best experts so that we have almost unanimously agreed upon the formula which our committee is bringing to you today. It is true that certain members of the Army, General Ridgway and others, would like to see a larger Army. So would many of us. In a sense, of course, they are prejudiced witnesses. I say that in the most pleasant sense because I admire them all very much, but they are prejudiced in that any commander would not be worth his salt if he purposely and willingly stood by and saw his tools taken away from him. Naturally, any commander never is quite satisfied that he has enough men or equipment to meet the tremendous responsibility we place on his shoulders. But, we have a formula which was produced to our committee by the best experts we know. I read to you what Secretary Wilson says about that. It is on page 32 of the hearings:

The determination of the strength of the Army, as well as of the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps, represents a decision reached after long study within the Department of Defense and the National Security Council and was finally approved by the President. It was not based upon the proposal of any particular individual.

This committee has adopted that program just as a jury decides on a verdict based on the best evidence they are able to get. Such is the testimony we have heard and it should not be lightly ignored. It has been pointed out by my colleague that we still have the greatest peacetime force that we have ever had and we must maintain it in readiness.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not also true that the Joint Chiefs of Staff passed on this matter of the size of the Army. We had hearings and discussions about that in the Armed Services Committee. As I understood, their final conclusion, it was not based on numbers, that is, on the numbers of peo-

ple you have in the Army. The decision was based on the combat capabilities of the individual soldiers, the various units of the division and the capability of the division. That is what tells you how good and how effective in combat the personnel of the division will be. You just cannot count bodies and determine what the size of our Armed Forces shall be. You must understand what equipment they have and what training they have and what morale they have, and all these with other factors will indicate what size a military unit should be to carry out its mission. Since the Joint Chiefs of Staff concluded that the size which the gentleman referred to was appropriate for the Army, I am willing to abide by their judgment because in my book they are the last word on this problem.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. The distinguished gentleman from California, a very important member of the great Committee on Armed Services, has expressed very ably the views, I think, of most of us. Incidentally, there are some factors we should take into consideration with respect to this program. It has been pointed out by my colleagues that the ground forces, though they may be smaller in number have a greatly increased firepower. They have greatly increased the percentage of combat ready troops as compared with the overall numbers in uniform because they have turned many jobs over to civilians. The numbers in the pipeline have been reduced, and it has been possible to reduce the numbers in training because of increased reenlistments of veterans. Then, above all, we have to look at it as a team proposition and a question of balance, and the thing that our allies and our friends are in a position to supply best for the team is infantry divisions and people on the ground.

We have great allies. When the Korean trouble started we had only half the force we have now. In addition to that, there was no Korean Army to mention, yet today it is one of the greatest standing armies in the world. The same thing may be said of the Chinese Nationalist Army. Our allies are strong in ground forces, and we must put our strength in other places, particularly in the air and on the sea, and in research and development, where incidentally there has been no reduction.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. We hear so much about the military trying to get too many men into the service. Do I understand someone is going to offer an amendment adding more than the Joint Chiefs of Staff want; that they are going to offer an amendment in defiance of the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and are going to force more people into the Army than those who are running the military say are needed?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. My understanding is that such amendments are to be offered. Why the particular magic number, I do not know quite what the reason is for the number he has chosen, but I believe the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania [Mr. Flood] is going to move that the Army retain the strength that it will have at the end of this fiscal year for the remainder of the next fiscal year.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Then I understand the gentleman to say that this bill is about 55 percent of our income and that the Joint Chiefs of Staff say that they do not need these additional men for the security of the country, and then somebody is going to offer an amendment that will cost tens of millions of dollars more to bring those men in?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. It will undoubtedly cost more than tens of millions. It will go into hundreds of millions more. Dollars are ammunition. There is nothing that is more wasteful than armed troops who are not engaged in fighting, or standing by. The only excuse is for insurance. If we have enough forces which the best judgment of our greatest military minds say is adequate insurance, anything over and beyond that is wasteful, and perhaps is defeating the very purpose we are trying to accomplish.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I understand it will cost hundreds of millions of dollars extra, and it may be possible that we will not balance the budget. These hundreds of millions of dollars extra will have to be borrowed for future generations to pay.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Not only that. There is another angle we should think about. We are told we are in a posture of readiness sufficient for national defense. If we increase it, it could be interpreted as saber rattling. The gentleman from North Carolina, a member of our subcommittee, made a very fine statement with regard to that matter. That is, that there is a lot more to this problem of maintaining peace than armed strength. If we give the world a picture of arming beyond the necessities for national defense and we increase the Army at this time rather than decrease it, it throws us open to misunderstanding throughout the world, which may be just enough to tilt the pendulum away from peace instead of toward it.

There is one other matter I would like to mention. We of the committee do not hesitate to take the gloves off and sail into the armed services when we think they are wrong. Often they are wrong. It is only logical, because running so stupendous, so huge an operation, if misunderstandings did not occur and mistakes were not made by the people in charge, they would not be human. However, I do want to suggest that great care be given in reading these headlines about huge waste, of overbuying and oversupplying.

Bear in mind that when they say "The Army has so many supplies on hand" that the word "Army" is very indefinite. Supplies for a million-man army would last only 3 months when that army is suddenly increased to a 4-million-man army.

It was brought out yesterday that our Army at the time of the trouble in Korea had sunk to one-fourteenth of what it had been a few years before. Purchases jumped up overnight. Incidentally our people cannot afford not to have combat rations on hand; and, incidentally, if you

care to read the record, you will find that new processes have made it possible to keep combat rations for 5 years by keeping them at a lower temperature without undue spoilage occurring.

We do not like eating combat rations in time of peace or times like the present except for training purposes and to reduce waste, but what might be a year's supply under present conditions might be but a few months' supply in an emergency. You must remember further that we tell the armed services to be ready to meet any emergency. So do not get unduly excited about some of the headlines.

Another thing we should bear in mind when we talk about manpower is the fact that the Armed Services Committee has reported out a bill which will be before the House in a few days to strengthen our Reserves. What we hope and plan for the Reserves gives further justification in cutting the size of our standing Army. We have high hopes that progress is going to be made in the very important field of having stronger Reserves. And do not forget that it is a great deal cheaper to have capable Reserves available than to have all actually working 365 days a year. Another point I hope we will bear in mind is that the availability of Reserves is dependent upon how quickly they can be put into action after an emergency arises. The fact that individuals are trained and even have had battle experience does not of necessity answer the question, because a unit cannot be put into action until it has had training as a unit any more than you could recruit a group of actors of Broadway experience and put them in a new play without rehearsal, or safely put a football team on the field without the players having practiced together.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It has been said already today that it costs the taxpayers about \$5,500 to maintain just one person in the armed services, whether an enlisted man or officer. That \$5,500 covers everything from his clothing to the equipment or the installation that he may be part of during that 1 year. Under the new Reserve bill to be considered next week it will be possible to maintain a Ready Reserve at the cost of \$1,000 per year, and a Standby Reserve at an annual cost of \$300 to the American taxpayer.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. One thing the committee is trying to work out is a plan whereby we can work up a good defense program without spending ourselves into bankruptcy. The committee is giving everything to the Reserve program that it can possibly use and spend to the real benefit of our defense.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think it is only fair to say to the Members of the House who are not conversant with the background of the gentleman from Maryland who now has the floor that he himself



has been a member of the military services for nearly 40 years, much of that time in the reserves. Having had that experience of possibly more than 40 years great weight is added to what he has to say.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

I can assure this House that the members of our committee have brought to it as best they could the experience they have gained over their lifetimes. I do not think there is any member of our committee who does not feel that this is a matter of as great importance as anything that can come before this body, and we have brought it to you in the best of faith after our best efforts, and we think we have brought you a good bill and one which will meet the needs of the occasion.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. These recommendations are made, of course, with the understanding that if an unforeseen emergency arises the Department can and will come back immediately to the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Not only is that so, but in the Army part of this bill we have left all of the cushion that could possibly be needed. If the world situation changed, if there were a sudden emergency, I do not believe the Army would have to wait 5 minutes to go into action, with the plans they have, and doubtlessly they have plans designed to meet whatever may take place.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it not also a fact that under the terms of this bill, section 616 to be exact, the President has the authority at any time he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense to waive the so-called antideficiency law and to spend the money available as rapidly as he sees fit?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. That is absolutely correct. As the gentleman from Massachusetts has pointed out, there is a latitude all through this bill to permit that. That is the whole purpose of the new look, the posture, the readiness, the ability to go in whatever direction circumstances may require and that with the least possible cost in time or money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. From what I hear of the bill that is coming up next week, the modified universal conscription bill, and there has been some discussion of it this afternoon, I am becoming more and more convinced that some people think we can disband the Regular Army with the passage of that bill and we are going to be able to have a Military Establishment capable of defending this country at practically no cost whatever.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I think the gentleman's observation is a little exaggerated, but I can assure him that it is my honest belief a sound reserve program will greatly reduce the cost of our national defense and will minimize the need for standing forces. But do not

forget that we are now on a 24-hour alert. We have to have a Regular Establishment, we have to have people standing on the ramparts, so to speak, because you cannot start to train a soldier, sailor, or marine to repel an atomic attack after it starts. You have to be in the trenches 24 hours a day and on the lookout 24 hours a day. So we will always need, as we now have, a very fine Regular Establishment.

Mr. Chairman, in closing let me sum up once more. As a jury we have heard the evidence. It has been overwhelmingly to the effect that the bill which we bring to you is by and large the outgrowth of the composite thinking of the greatest leaders we have in our armed services and in the appropriate civilian parts of our Government. The committee is convinced that this is a good bill. We may differ about any one of the items, but with the fine quality of leadership that we have in all branches of our Defense Department, both military and civilian, it would indeed be unwise, and it would seem to me to be rather presumptuous, for us as laymen to sit down and write a new ticket in an appropriation bill without even the concurrence of the legislative committee. I am told that the leaders of that great committee are in general sympathy with the provisions of this bill and the size of the forces provided. I know when my friend from Pennsylvania addresses you with his usual eloquence, he will move you when he talks about his marines and his soldiers and sailors, but even though I respect his good faith and his fine personality, I hope you will stick by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and back up your committee.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I should like the Committee to note my strong support for lines 4 through 13 on page 4 of H. R. 6042, which appropriates \$100 million for reserve tools and facilities. This fund is used for the purchase of specialized tools and production equipment of long-lead-time character for mobilization purposes.

The capacity of the machine-tool industry—the backbone of any peacetime industrial or wartime armament program—has been seriously damaged by reduction in tariff protection and because contractors and industries generally went to Europe to import machine tools during the Korean war. Carefully planned Government purchases, of the type covered in this legislation, will do much to alleviate this situation. This equipment—periodically modernized to meet current weapons design—will be held in storage. Having received such contracts the factories will be kept in production.

The machines to be procured under this program are the type that could not be commandeered from private industry in time of an emergency. Typical of the items being procured are large

tools such as planer-type millers, double-housing planers, vertical-boring mills, contour-stretch forming machines, gear hobbers, and mechanical and hydraulic presses costing up to \$1 million apiece. The delivery time for these runs from 12 months to 2 years. Consequently, this long-lead-time equipment would not become available for use for many months after an emergency if we waited until then to order. Procurement of these long-lead-time tools at this time will serve to eliminate bottlenecks in the critical early days of an emergency.

I commend the distinguished members of the Committee on Appropriations for recommending the full amount of the Defense Department's request.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he has any further requests for time?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, this is a very interesting situation. The Committee has been discussing this bill for the past 2 days. For 6 hours in their might and their majesty they have supported the bill now before you. I have but 20 minutes to reply to this heavy artillery, but I hope the inherent merit of the argument that I present because of its value can do in 20 minutes without my tongue all that is necessary to answer this barrage of the last 2 days.

Now, what good are all of your dollars going to do you and what good is all of your wealth about which you are so gravely concerned going to do you if you are not adequately and properly defended from enemy attack? You are directing your attentions today in this debate to the intentions of an enemy and to your own intentions. Well, now, instead of being concerned with intentions of an enemy or our proposals or intentions, let me ask you to simply analyze the facts as they exist, and then you apply your treatment there.

My friends on this Committee, from the interrogations that were made, say this is the product of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Why should you presume to substitute your judgment and your opinion for that of the great military and civilian experts evidenced in the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the civilian Secretary? Well, my answer to that is very simple. I do not presume to substitute my judgment for that of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, because this budget is not and never has been the budget of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and any impression that has been created here today or yesterday that this budget was brought to this Congress by the Joint Chiefs of Staff is not true.

Mr. Chairman, there are four members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General Ridgway, the Army member, is against this proposal and has made his position clear time and time again, and his position and courage of standing up to another great general, the President of the United States, is going to cost General Ridgway his job. He is going

to be fired as commander of the Army. He is against the bill.

General Shepherd of the Marine Corps was placed on the Joint Chiefs of Staff by this Congress. He was opposed by the Army. He was fought by the Navy, as the Marines always are, and it took the Congress of the United States to give the great Marine Corps a voice on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Now, there I have one vote, Ridgway. General Shepherd, under interrogation by me, stated very clearly, he is against this cut. That gives me two votes on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. So, I am willing to go to this jury 50-50. They have got Carney, CO of the Navy, and Radford, another sailor, and they have two votes. I have got two votes, Ridgway of the Army and Shepherd of the Marine Corps. Now, that is where this case stands as we go to this jury.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. No; I cannot yield now, much as I would like to.

Mr. TABER. Did the gentleman forget the Air Force?

Mr. FLOOD. I am not forgetting the Air Force. I am coming to the Air Force. The Air Force is the white-haired boy. How in the world could we forget the Air Force? Even my distinguished friend from Georgia, Admiral Vinson, is now for the Air Force. I am for the Air Force, too. I want the Air Force for my amendment. So I am for the Air Force.

A great Republican President once said—you know, there were really two Roosevelts and I am talking about Teddy this time—Teddy said, "Tread softly but carry a big stick." I am for peace. I am not rattling any saber. Let us tread softly, and let us carry this big stick.

Do not forget, Mr. Chairman, that it was in this very Chamber—and many of you and I recall it well—that 4 months before Pearl Harbor—it was a miracle, an act of Almighty God—4 months before Pearl Harbor, the Army of the United States was saved from dissolution by one vote. You then tried to destroy the Army, 4 months before Pearl Harbor and, thank God, one vote saved the Army. It took Pearl Harbor to prevent the disintegration of the Army in releasing from duty men who were over the age of 28.

I am not looking into any crystal ball here. I am not asking you to raise the size of the Army. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this clear. The newspapers, and the radio, and this discussion have distorted the picture. I do not want to see the Army raised or increased by one single soldier. I do not want to see an Army provided for in this budget with one single extra gun. All that I want you to do, in the face of the existing circumstances in the world today—and I do not have the time to take you on a Cook's tour of the map of the world; you know the situation. For heaven's sake, let your mind's eye tour the world, north and south, east and west, at this very minute as I speak. All I want you to do is to keep your hands off the armed services. Leave them alone for at least one more fiscal period. Do not cut this Army.

Are you going to send the spokesmen for America to world conferences looking for peace with headlines ahead of them—"The Congress of the United States cuts the defense forces. One hundred thousand cut from the Army"?

Let me tell you this. There are 15,000 men to a division. And you want to cut the Army.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield; the gentleman knows why.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I merely want to correct a misstatement.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield. There are 15,000 men to a division. You want to cut the Army. It is said that I want to raise it 89,000. I want to leave it where it is supposed to be on June 30, 1955.

Do you know that in the Far East, in the entire Pacific, facing the onslaught of the Reds you have only 4½ Army divisions and 2 combat teams, 1 in Okinawa and 1 in Japan? At 15,000 men to a division, you are cutting out of this budget more soldiers than you have in the entire Pacific theater today. Do you know how many divisions you have in NATO? You have five divisions. This cut that you want to make, the number of men that you want to take out of the Army, will equal in bodies the equivalent of five divisions that you have in western Europe. That is what you are up against. That is on the basis of 15,000 men to a division.

Let me say this: The Joint Chiefs of Staff before our committee said in effect, "Yes, when the boss wanted it done, we went along. Yes, we went along when the boss wanted it done." Well, Ridgway would not go along, and he is going to lose his job, and Shepherd had the courage to stand up and say in effect, "I did not want this cut in the Marines. I did not want it."

Let me tell you what General Ridgway said about the Russian Army. If you think you are so good, the most powerful army in the world today is the Soviet. They are not cutting. They are raising their Russian military budget 25 percent. You want a balance of power. Do you know what this cut is based on?

This cut is based on the intention of balancing the budget. A few minutes ago somebody said, "Maybe, perhaps, I think, by golly, we might gee whizz balance the budget." That is nonsense. There is no more chance of balancing this budget and the budget has no more chance of being balanced than the proverbial snowball in you know where. Certainly not. That is a sham and a fraud. So there is the big reason for the cut in the Army, there is the big reason for the cut in the Marine Corps, there is the big reason for the cut in the Navy, in ships. "Let us balance the budget." That is a sham. The budget will not be balanced. There goes the big reason.

The next reason given was, "We are going to get divisions from the Germans, 12 divisions. That will take the place of our arms cut." But you and I know that you do not have the 12 divisions in the Germans, and I am talking about the budget for the fiscal year ending June

30, 1956, and you will not have 12 German divisions next year or the year after or the year after, or the year after that.

Forty divisions in Korea? You will not get any place, and God forbid the fighting starts again in Korea, unless you send the Marines and unless you send back the Army divisions. I do not care if the Koreans and the Thais and the South Indochinese have 100 divisions, if anything happens they will not be able to stand up and they will not be able to do anything effectively until you send back American marines and American sailors and American airmen and American soldiers.

Admiral Radford and General Ridgway in the hearings answered "Yes" when I asked them those questions. That is what happened. So there goes your second big reason.

The third big reason was the Reserves. Oh, we are going to have Reserves they say. Let us cut the Army, the Navy, and the Marines, we are going to have a great Reserve. Well, you have not even passed that bill yet. What Reserves? What are you talking about? My friends are going to save the Army with Reserves? Not only are the Reserves not in being but you have not passed the law.

There are the three reasons. The National Guard? A great organization. What will happen to the National Guard in case of the outbreak of hostilities? They will cannibalize the National Guard to beef up combat divisions, as they always have. That is what will happen to the National Guard Reserves.

It takes 9 months—do not forget this—9 months to train a man or a division and to put them in the line in combat. The experts tell me that in this atomic war it is going to be over in the first few days. I do not think this is so—but some of the record evidence shows this. What good will your Reserve do? What good will your draftees do you? You will have to train them for 9 months. If all this is true. In 9 months you will be dead ducks—you and the Reserves. What good is that argument for cutting the Army and the Marines and the Navy in 1956? I asked General Shepherd about the Marine Corps. I said, "General, do you want this cut?" He said, "No." I said, "General, how many Marines must you have? How many did you ask for?" He said, "215,000." And do you know what they have done with the Marines? They cut them to 193,000—they cut 30,000 Marines in 2 years, 20 percent of the elite corps—20 percent of your great initial combat force—20 percent of the corps which, according to the strategy and philosophy of this administration, in case of an outbreak of hostilities, they say, "We have a balanced force—this is a balanced force which is set forth in this budget and we will be able to receive the initial impact of an enemy and counter attack."

To be able to counter attack and to be able to meet the first days of atomic warfare, your forces for defense must be forces in being, forces trained, forces ready for the field. And you have not got enough of them. You do not have



them now. How can you afford to cut the equivalent of five divisions out of the Army? How can you afford to cut 20 percent of the United States Marines? I need not speak for the Marines. The great history of the Marine Corps is far more eloquent than my poor efforts. I leave the fate of the United States Marines in the capable hands and the great heart of this House, which has never failed to support the Marines and which has prevented efforts made by the Pentagon before this and now the White House to cut the Marines year after year. Oh, I know a great general, who will remain nameless, who said that they ought to disband the Marine Corps because they make good infantry officers for the Army. How do you like that? That is the opinion downtown about the United States Marines. What did they do with the Navy? What did the big Navy brass with the plumes and the shoulder boards do when they wanted to cut 100 ships out of the Navy? Did they cut the great big carriers? Did they cut the glorious battle items? Did they cut the big brass and the beautiful ships? Oh, no—they cut the small boats of the amphibious corps. They cut the small boats that the Marines must have in the Pacific or for amphibious warfare. "Oh." They said, "Don't worry about that Mr. Flood. We will get them back in 30 days." Do they have an arrangement with the Chinese and the Russians that they will wait 30 days? Is this medieval warfare when by agreement you did not fight from sunset on Saturday until sunrise on Monday morning? 30 days? They say no Marines are transferred anyhow. Oh, they are consistent—they are consistent. They cut the Marines 20 percent—30,000 Marines. General Shepherd said to the committee, "You will destroy the effectiveness of the Marines, we will have no staying power. We will not be able to secure replacements." That is what you are doing to the Marines. Who said that—Flood? Why, no, the Joint Chief of Staff—General Shepherd.

General Ridgway said, "Give me 173,000 more soldiers." What does the committee want to do? They want to cut that down to \$1,025,000? Do you want to cut them nearly 100,000? Who asked for that? Somebody on the street corner? No; the commanding officer of the Army. Do you want authority? I am not substituting my opinion. I am giving you two voices of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. That is what you are confronted with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.  
All time has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all members of the committee may have permission to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the present bill (H. R. 6042) provides appropriations for all regular military functions for 1956 except construction and other public works, estimates for which are now pending.

The committee, in my opinion, has made an exceedingly commendable report. Its study of the needs of our military forces has been careful and sincere. Of course, there may be instances with respect to which there may be some differences of opinion, but, on the whole, the provisions of the bill have been well thought out and due consideration given to our needs for adequate national security.

Furthermore, I am of the opinion that this Nation has never had at any time more competent leaders in our military activities. I do not refer alone to those in the military service in its several branches. They are men of exceptional ability. We have confidence in their ability. We are fortunate to have such military leaders in times such as these, and, particularly fortunate to have civilian leaders of outstanding ability. Secretary of Defense Wilson has brought into the service of our Nation his great capacity to evaluate our needs and to procure a high degree of production in the shortest possible time and at the least cost. Nor, can we overlook nor fail to emphasize how fortunate this Nation is in this time of uncertainty to have in the office of President a man with the greatest military skill in all the world. He knows more than any one else in all the world the military requirements of the present time. His background of experience creates confidence in his judgment as to what should be the kind and number of our military forces. Certainly, we know that he will never give his approval to any military appropriation that is not necessary, and, equally certain we can be that he will not accept anything less than what he considers necessary at the present time.

This bill is based on the budget submitted by the President. It, consequently, has his support and it is entitled to our support. We should never forget that weakness in our Military Establishment endangers our peace. The view expressed by President Theodore Roosevelt that "we should carry a big stick and speak softly" is as sound as when he uttered those words.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, this is a comprehensive appropriation bill to provide funds for the defense of this Nation at home and abroad. I want to compliment this committee for the thorough and detailed work and study they have applied to all of the various departments of defense. The economy and caution which the committee has shown in preparing this bill indicates that every consideration has been given to adequate defense in the event of any contingency, including an atomic attack.

The Departments of the Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the Air Force have been given careful consideration as to their needs.

There is a saving of \$350,000 in the Office of Secretary of Defense, \$289,248,986 in the Department of the Army, and \$640,989,500 in the Department of the Navy. The increase in this bill is for the Air Force which will provide funds for the most powerful air force in the world. We must keep our Air Force strong and modern to meet the challenge of our op-

position and to be ready for any event of attack upon us.

I favor the passage of this bill in the belief that our national defense must be maintained and that the only sure way to honorable peace is to be prepared for defense against any attack, otherwise we could be led into appeasement and defeat. I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, in considering a bill such as H. R. 6042, Members of this body, like myself, who are not on the appropriations subcommittees of necessity must carefully follow the explanation and argument of the distinguished members like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], and others who have long experience in defense appropriations and the advantage of study of the current situation and testimony during the past 3 months of committee hearings. When one considers the wide range of disagreement between experts as to what form and the duration, as well as the locality, of any possible war in which the United States might become involved, naturally, it becomes evident that an agreement is almost impossible on the relative emphasis which should be given to respective air, naval, and ground services.

It seems, however, there is general agreement that military expenditures will have to be continued on a high level for years to come and, therefore, the right policy is one that provides a level which can be sustained economically over a long period.

After listening to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], I am convinced H. R. 6042 is based on a composite judgment which provides a reasonable degree of military strength as between two extreme viewpoints.

Therefore, I am not supporting amendments to deviate from the Appropriations Committee's carefully considered recommendation, and in so expressing myself I am frank in stating I am following the judgment of better qualified men and am basing my position, in particular, on the President's statement that he was satisfied with the Defense Department's program.

Now I would like to express my views in regard to two policy matters which are included in this bill and about which I do know a little more than the average perhaps, because of experiences in the past and their effect on defense installations in my district.

I refer to pages 49 and 50, specifically sections 638 and 639. Section 638 provides that no funds provided in this act shall be used for moving a major permanent facility without justifying the move before the appropriate congressional committee.

In view of recent press reports that the Air Force would discard the standing policy, most carefully arrived at, of dispersal within an area and instead move installations away from the east and west coasts, I believe any attempt to delete this section should be defeated. Sometimes we get officials who become overzealous or overimbed with overall plans. Inspired by the finest of motives,

I am sure, these planners overlook one essential of defense and that is the human element. We get a skilled team of workers together with homes and roots deep in a community. Russia moves communities, but America does not. The people of our country are entitled to pursue happiness wherever they want—and they are not going to be moved out of one area into another. Dispersal inside of one geographic area is such that it is possible to hold skilled workers together. Otherwise, you disrupt an entire project. The workers will turn to some other employment rather than give up their homes and leave their schools, churches and friends.

The other policy in section 639 has to do with preventing what I have on a previous occasion referred to as officials going on an "ideological spree." This section provides that funds appropriated in this act for work traditionally performed by civilians employed by the Defense Department shall not be contracted to private enterprise unless justified before a committee of Congress as economically sound and likewise without endangering national security.

My point here is that there are many operations in an integrated military installation which of themselves might appear to be infringing on private business, but when considered as a whole, if contracted out, would adversely affect efficiency and be economically costly and impractical.

The present criteria for eliminating such work does not include the factor of economy, and I am glad to find this provision in the bill. I hope the membership will resist any attempt to take out this section.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, later in the day when we return to the House, I shall ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and insert proper excerpts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$60,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Defense for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; \$12 million.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the House properly expressed grave concern about the cost to the taxpayers of the negotiated contracts which are now in use for the procurement of such major articles of military equipment as aircraft and tanks. It was suggested yesterday that sufficient money could be saved by putting an end to negotiated contracts in the military-purchase program to defray the cost of the farm parity-price program.

There are also other ways to save money and we should not overlook them. I suggest a course today that would make it possible for us to defray the cost of all the Hill-Burton hospitals that are programmed, or to build badly needed schools throughout the Nation, or to provide vaccine free to many of the children of the world for the diseases for which there are known vaccines, or to build factories which would provide employment for the unemployed in the distressed economic areas of this Nation today.

Such savings could be realized by eliminating the greater number of the atomic bomb tests. I suspect we have spent that kind of money already this year in tests on the Yucca Flats. I know that many of you have wondered what it actually cost to keep 1,500 civilian defense observers at the expensive hotels on the Las Vegas strip for 10 days waiting for one shot, or what it cost to have several hundred assorted generals fly in from places as far away as Panama and Alaska, most of them with their own Government planes with standby crews. But this is only a small part of the cost of one test. Think of the cost of the bombs, of the test equipment, and all the hundreds of items and activities that go into the preparations for each test.

I do not question the necessity for testing of military equipment. I know that it is essential that we have adequate information, but I seriously doubt that there is anything more that we need to learn from further wholesale live atomic tests. I believe that simulated atomic tests will in most cases suffice for the training that is needed henceforth.

I do know the world is seriously disturbed by the emphasis that we place on atomic energy for destruction. The Soviets have carefully portrayed us as warmongers who seek only to destroy the rest of mankind. Our allies are genuinely disturbed by what they interpret as emphasis on mass destruction. Surely we can now begin to place more emphasis on atomic energy for peaceful pursuits. Surely such a course would strengthen our bid for world peace at this critical phase of negotiations.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great revival of interest in the life and career of Col. David Crockett. To us in Texas and Tennessee his memory will always be dear.

I want to read to the House a few brief excerpts from a report of a speech which Colonel Crockett made on the floor of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, May 19, 1830, in opposition to a bill for the removal of the Indians. I do so that we may have an understanding of the great moral and political courage which he possessed, and I do so because I want to contrast his sentiment and his convictions with the present philosophy

that "to get along you must go along." He is reported officially as having said:

He had his constituents to settle with, he was aware; and should like to please them as well as other gentlemen; but he had also a settlement to make at the bar of his God; and what his conscience dictated to be just and right he would do, be the consequences what they might. He believed that the people who had been kind enough to give him their suffrages, supposed him to be an honest man, or they would not have chosen him. If so, they could not but expect that he should act in the way he thought honest and right.

But from the first hour he had entered a legislative hall, he had never known what party was in legislation; and God forbid he ever should. He went for the good of the country, and for that only. What he did as a legislator, he did conscientiously. He should love to go with his colleagues, and with the West and the South generally, if he could; but he never would let party govern him in a question of this great consequence.

He knew that he stood alone, having, perhaps, none of his colleagues from his State agreeing in sentiment. He could not help that. He knew that he should return to his home glad and light in heart, if he voted against the bill. He felt that it was his wish and purpose to serve his constituents honestly, according to the light of his conscience. The moment he should exchange his conscience for mere party views, he hoped his Maker would no longer suffer him to exist. He spoke the truth in saying so. If he should be the only Member of that House who voted against the bill, and the only man in the United States who disapproved, he would still vote against it; and it would be a matter of rejoicing to him till the day he died, that he had given the vote. He had been told that he should be prostrated; but if so, he would have the consolation of conscience. He would obey that power, and glorified in the deed. He cared not for popularity, unless it could be obtained by upright means. He had seen much to disgust him here; and he did not wish to represent his fellow citizens, unless he could be permitted to act conscientiously.

I wish, Mr. Chairman, that those immortal words could be inscribed on a tablet and placed in the House of Representatives. I am sure that if they are practiced by you and me, the security, the liberty, and the happiness of this Republic would be insured for all generations to come.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I want to commend my distinguished friend from Texas for these very fine remarks he has made about our former Tennessean and Texan, Davy Crockett.

David Crockett certainly lives in the hearts and lives of all men who are interested in the progress of our great Nation.

I just had the privilege today of accepting an invitation to Lawrenceburg, Tenn., next Saturday, where in Lawrence County they are going to have Davy Crockett Day. There is a statue of David Crockett in the city square in Lawrenceburg which bears an inscription in these words:

Be sure that you are right and then go ahead.



Those were the sentiments of Davy Crockett. I want to join in the remarks of my friend from Texas in appreciation of the great life of Davy Crockett.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### EMERGENCY FUND

For the transfer by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any appropriation for military functions under the Department of Defense available for research and development, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred, \$25 million.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] for taking a very courageous position. It seems to me clear that considering the respect in which this Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations is held, it takes real conviction and courage to oppose its recommendation, particularly when it is in line with the recommendation of our soldier President.

However, I rise to remind the House of the fact that in another day under another President with a different Secretary of Defense, the House went along, as did the Senate, with defense appropriation cuts which later proved to be unwise. Personally, I am convinced that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is precisely correct when he says that the reason for these cuts is an overriding desire to balance the budget. I am convinced and have been convinced since the advent of this administration to power that many substantive decisions have been made not with a regard to the substance of the decision, but with a regard to the question of whether or not a balanced budget would be brought closer.

It is my conviction, Mr. Chairman, that if we are to survive in this world today, when we face the threat of war, and we will for a generation or more, we must be prepared to fight, not only a cataclysmic atomic world war III, prepared to fight it so that it will never come, prepared to fight so that we can maintain the peace, but also we must be prepared to fight those wars which people who have had no experience with them call the little wars, the brush-fire wars. The people who die in the little wars, the brush-fire wars, are just as dead as would be the millions who would die in an atomic conflict. If we are fully prepared to fight them they need not come either. It is my conviction that when we fall into the trap of putting a balanced budget first and fail to see the error of our ways, not only before World War II and World War I, but also post-World War II, when we fail to recognize that our demobilization after V-J Day and our failure to recognize that force was the only thing that was understood by the Communist powers, we are, no matter how good our intentions, endangering our country, our future, and the future of our children.

I submit that today, as in the twenties and the thirties, strength is the only road to peace, and I am profoundly disturbed by the fact that our strength in the

Marines and in the Army is being reduced by recommendation of this administration, which there is every indication that the Congress will support.

Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support the Flood amendments which seek to maintain the level of the Army and the Marine Corps at that at which they are today. If I thought there were hope that such amendments might be passed, I would be in favor of amendments to increase our strength so that it would be at a level equal to our commitments and so that it could not be said around the world, as it is being said today, that America is bluffing.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I share and share fully with the gentleman from Missouri the high regard and respect which he has expressed for the members of this fine committee. I have read to the limit of my ability, in the brief time they have been available to me, the hearings conducted before the Subcommittee on Appropriations which has dealt with this vital problem, and I have been impressed and impressed deeply by the thoroughness with which the committee has explored the many puzzling and challenging questions associated with our defense in this time of peril.

Like the gentleman from Missouri, I am compelled to make up my mind in regard to these proposed cuts largely upon the basis of what is in the record, and I find reading these hearings time and time again—and I can understand it; I realize it is necessarily so—time and time again you find the expert witnesses on defense going off the record to answer vital questions. I do not think any Member of this House can read these hearings and read what is in the record and what has been expressed and is there in print to read without having a profound sense of disquiet, discomfort, and apprehension at the thought of reducing our conventional forces, our conventional weapons, and our orthodox forces. You cannot read the report of the committee; you cannot turn to page 19 and read what Matthew Ridgway said; you cannot turn to page 30 and read what Secretary Thomas of the Navy said; you cannot read what General Shepherd of the United States Marine Corps said without feeling that apprehension at the thought of reducing our conventional weapons. Each and every one of these men, experts in their line, is authority for the fact that we reduce our effectiveness in time of emergency if we cut these ground forces and cut the conventional weapons as it is proposed that they be cut. Yet, we see Secretary Wilson saying in connection with these hearings that it is proposed we set up a Defense Establishment which is adequate to fight a nonatomic war as well as an atomic war. How can we fight a nonatomic war and yet reduce our conventional strength, our conventional fighting forces? I say the Senator from Missouri, Mr. SYMINGTON, is right when he says if we go through with these proposed cuts, we commit ourselves irrevocably to the use of atomic weapons in the event of disaster somewhere across the world front today. If we want to keep the strength

of America strong and adequate to meet what the gentleman from Missouri has described as small wars or brush fire wars, I insist that this Nation can afford to go along with the recommendations of General Ridgway, Secretary Thomas, and General Shepherd. I have deep affection for the members of this committee, but I have been impressed that several of them in private conversation have said, "We have to take a calculated risk. We have to gamble in this day and hour."

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this Nation can afford to take a risk. I do not believe this Nation can afford to gamble when we have the resources, we have the power to keep these conventional forces strong enough to deter aggression throughout the world and to assure American victory if we do have fighting.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I think the gentleman remembers the name of a famous war-time play.

In this situation, if there is to be a calculated risk taken, we must be sure, for the safety of America, that there is no margin for error.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am afraid there is no margin for error in this day and time. Personally I see no reason for taking the calculated risk, and I hope this House will vote for the amendments which will shortly be offered which will assure adequate strength in conventional fighting forces as well as in the atomic weapons.

May I say at this point that I heartily approve of many of the actions of this committee. I approve what they are doing with regard to the Reserve forces, the buildup of the Reserve strength. I approve what they are doing with regard to the National Guard and the Air National Guard. These are wise things and good things. But why not go the full route? Why not buy as much insurance as the Nation is capable of buying? Why not make it certain that as far as the Marine Corps and as far as the divisional strength on the ground are concerned to meet the threats which confront the world today in this hour of peril, that we have those necessary forces?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be granted 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman was a Member of this body last year at the time when the military budget for the fiscal year 1955 was approved. The record shows that on April 29, 1954, the House of Representatives by a vote of 378 to 0 approved the budget for the so-called New Look. I do not know whether the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] was here and voted on

that day or not, but I assume he was. Therefore, any person who voted that day—and there were 378 for the bill and none against it—voted to approve the New Look, voted to put into operation the strength figures for this year and next year for the Department of the Army.

We have taken that step by a unanimous vote of the House of Representatives, and included in the recommendations last year was a strength figure of 17 divisions for the Army, as of June 30, 1955. The picture today is even better. We have, I think, 19 and we expect to have 18 a year hence.

I call that to the attention of the Members of this body, that 378 voted for this program last year and none voted against it. The New Look is part of this program for fiscal year 1956.

Mr. EDMONDSON. But it is my understanding, if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] will recognize it, that this proposal cuts beneath the Eisenhower recommendation.

Mr. FORD. No; that is not entirely accurate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended an additional 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Oklahoma is not quite correct in that regard. In the case of the Army, there is a \$20 million total cut out of a military budget for the Army of \$7.3 billion. The minor dollar cut has nothing to do with manpower strength figures.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] is subject to justifiable criticism.

Mr. FORD. I should be glad to listen to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Take this bill today. There may be parts of this bill that many Members may not favor, but when it comes to final passage on rollcall we will vote for it. It does not necessarily follow that because 378 Members voted for the appropriation bill last year that they favored every provision in the bill. The gentleman knows that himself.

Mr. FORD. Certainly, it is a fair assumption that one more or less approves legislation by voting for it. I do not see how anyone can defend his position that he is against the bill when he is on record for it.

Mr. McCORMACK. If a Member voted against the appropriation bill last year he would have voted against appropriating anything for defense.

The gentleman knows that when a bill comes to final passage the situation is entirely different than when it is before the committee in the amendment stage. Many Members vote for amendments to a bill, and even if those amendments are voted down they vote for the bill.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, it is hard to break with the past. We cling to the old ways, the old times, the old weapons, and the old strategy. Always there are those who want to fight the next war like they fought the last war. And invariably it has ended in disaster.

The French won the first war with their famous 75's. They wanted to fight the second war with the same 75's. But the Central Powers had long since outdistanced the 75's and only the timely intervention of American troops with modern weapons and strategy saved the French Empire.

In every branch of industry modern machinery has reduced the need for personnel. We now do with machinery what formerly required many hands. Recently I heard an aged farmer say that when he first started farming it required 15 men to harvest his wheat and he sat on the fence and watched them. Now, thanks to his combine, he harvests the wheat himself—and the 15 men sat on the fence and watched him.

In war the same principles apply. Machinery supplants men and dispenses with the need for soldiers. In the first war it would have required many divisions to take Hiroshima. But 1 plane and 1 bomb did the work more effectively than a hundred thousand infantrymen. Today we are still further advanced in mechanism and require still fewer men.

Heaven help us if we ever have to depend on foot soldiers to win a war. Russia has incomparably the greatest army ever mobilized. Through sheer numbers and with modern armament the Soviets can overrun Europe and Asia within 30 to 60 days.

My good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania says the next war will be of short duration. We are told by those best qualified to judge that it will be determined in the first 10 days or 2 weeks at most. That does not mean that the war will be over in that time but it will have been definitely decided within that time.

Evidence was submitted in the committee to the effect that it would be 10 days to 2 weeks before the Navy could get into the fight and it would take a year for the Army to get in. Any opportunity for participation by the additional troops proposed by the pending amendment would be long past before they could get into the fight—even if the Russians sat down and waited for them.

Members of the committee have been informed by the highest military authority that no further divisions are needed—or could be used even if available.

We were also told at the same time that even the reserves would not be needed for combat duty. The only occasion for providing reserves would be in event of the bombing of our cities by the enemy. If our cities are bombed—as they are certain to be if war is declared—chaos would follow. We could not bury our dead. All semblance of law and

order would disappear. With food and water and other supplies contaminated and all communication and transportation facilities wrecked, with survivors fleeing defenseless and hopeless in every direction, martial law would be the only recourse. The 60 years' supply of canned hamburgers if still accessible would prove a boon but it would require reserve troops to control the riots and carry out the orders of the Commander in Chief—or whoever succeeded him. Combat troops to meet and engage the enemy would long since have been bypassed. The decisive stage of the war would be over before they could fire a shot.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, here in the press and heat of debate, late in the afternoon of this long and trying day, let us pause long enough to take our bearings. The supreme executive authority recommends this reduction. And incidentally it is in keeping with our policy of international peace. While Russia is talking peace, but feverishly increasing its armies, we are not only urging peace but reducing our troops. The Executive recommends this reduction. Here in the House the committee, which has spent months in intensive study and exhaustive hearings, likewise recommends the reduction. And may I emphasize the fact that this subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], with panels headed by Vice Chairman SHEPPARD of California, and SIKES of Florida, is composed of some of the ablest and most experienced men in the House. Both the subcommittee and the committee voted—not quite unanimously but almost unanimously—to report the bill in its present form.

And I do not have to remind you that important testimony, submitted in executive session, is not on the record. They have been briefed on confidential matters and have information which they cannot pass on.

I trust the Members of the House will consider carefully the recommendation of these belabored men, from both the executive and legislative branches of the Government, before they vote to change this paragraph of the bill.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let us see. I think of a story I heard once. There was a boy in my hometown who was drinking a little too much good Pennsylvania rye whisky. His father took him up on the side of a hill looking over our valley. There were a lot of distilleries down in the valley. He said, "Now, look, son." That was after supper, at night. He said, "Look, son, you cannot drink all that whisky. You cannot drink all the whisky that all these great distilleries can turn out down there, can you?" And



the boy, looking at them, said, "Well, I guess you are right, pop, but I certainly got them working night shifts, haven't I?" Well, they are certainly bringing up the varsity on this one, when the distinguished chairman comes here to scare you to death. It sounded like a hallowe'en speech. He had skeletons rattling all over the floor. A-bombs! Let me tell you that the way this A-bomb and the H-bomb are developing, and the way nuclear and fissionable material is being utilized for war by a potential enemy and by our friends, you are going to have a stalemate. You are rapidly reaching the point that before you push the button, before you get as far as push-button warfare, there is not going to be any pushbutton warfare. Everybody has scared everybody else to death.

I was out there at a couple of these firecrackers, with my friend from Florida and my friend from Maryland. We were not back in these dens of sin and iniquity in Las Vegas. We were in the trenches with the troops. That is the last time I will try that one. The next time it is Las Vegas for me, too.

Now, do not worry about this A-bomb war. Let me tell you this. Indeed, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] says, there are 3,500 pages of testimony that are not printed. Secret. Cloak and dagger stuff. Even this mustache of mine should have been in that act. Very, very secret indeed. Very theatrical. But let me tell you this, the gentleman from Missouri did not tell you what that secret evidence was, and I cannot tell you either, but I will settle with him if he will go 50-50 with me. Remember I have already got two votes from the Joint Chiefs of Staff for you. There are only four. I have Sheppard and Ridgway. He has got Kearney and Radford. He has got two sailors. I have got two soldiers. I have to go out and fight this war, with soldiers and marines on the ground.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] wants to abolish the Army, abolish the Navy, and just have an Air Force. Now that is all right, provided they talk this over with a potential enemy, but that has not been done. This might be a conventional war, and the Russians have the biggest army in the world. They are building the biggest Navy in the world. They have more snorkel submarines today than the Germans had when they nearly destroyed England and the United States at the beginning of the last war. The Russians have the biggest army. They are building the biggest navy. They are building the biggest marine corps. They are building the biggest air corps. Why? Peace. Prepare for peace. You are going to cut the Marines. You are going to cut the Army. People ask you, Why do you want this done? Why do you want to cut this budget? I do not want to raise anything. I do not want another man. I do not want another gun. All I want you to do, because of the circumstances as they exist today, is for God's sake leave this alone for 1 more year. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an attempt on the part of the committee to cut the budget, because the figures for personnel and all the major activities of the whole Department of Defense are carried at the budgetary figure. The cuts that are made come as a result of the combing of things that were absolutely unnecessary.

Now what is this story about personnel in this picture? The Army, according to this estimate, will be 89,000 less men in the regular Army on the 30th of June 1956, than on the 30th of June 1955, but the National Guard and Reserves will be increased in that same period 91,000. Those men in the National Guard are just as good as regulars, and they can be drawn in and in 3 weeks they can be used in any way that they are needed. We know what happened before. We know what happened in Korea. We know that those people were the best troops at the time and the ones that carried the load until the Army could be prepared.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I refuse to yield because I want the people to understand what the facts are. I do not want them to be fooled.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I will not yield to the gentleman and I ask for order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman obviously declines to yield.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, are we going to have an Army that we can afford to have in accordance with the recommendations of the greatest military leader in the world, the President of the United States, or are we going to run out on him? Are we going to provide the defenses that we need to meet our situation by building up our airplane power, both in the Air Force and Navy, or are we going to mess the whole thing up and get into line with some program that is not in the best interests of the defense of the United States?

Let me give you the Navy picture. There is a cut of 8,400 in the personnel of the Navy, but an increase of 20,000 in the Reserves of the Navy. There is a cut—and just see how small this is—of 12,000 in the personnel of the Marine Corps and an increase of 10,500 men in the Reserves, or a net decrease of only 1,500 in the Marine Corps. Those fellows in the Marine Corps Reserve can be brought right up to full usefulness in a very few weeks because that Reserve with the modern method of handling it is going to be a lot better than any Reserve that we ever had.

Are we going along and try to put our defense on a forward-looking, up-to-date basis, or are we going to tear to pieces the thoughtfulness and the ideas of the folks who really know what we are up against? Are we going to have an effective fighting force or, are we going to let it go and drift along and try to keep up with a lot of things we do not need more of at this time?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the gentleman from Pennsylvania in committee when he offered his amendments to maintain the size of the Armed Forces; I shall support the amendments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania when he offers them on the floor again.

I dislike very much to disagree with the chairman of my committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], for whom I have the greatest affection, but I cannot share the confidence which he has stated he possesses in the Secretary of Defense.

I think that the Secretary of Defense has been changing his mind each year, too. Decisions made one year are reversed the next. There is no steady, stable defense policy.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. I did not, as I recall it, at any time refer to the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. YATES. That is correct. The gentleman spoke about the wishes of the greatest soldier in the world. I assumed, however, he was including the chain of command and that his reference to the greatest soldier in the world included the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. CANNON. I assure the gentleman, I referred to a much higher and more experienced authority than the Secretary of Defense—eminent both in war and in peace.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. In just a moment.

Is there any statement in this RECORD that the President of the United States favors these cuts?

There is a statement by the Secretary of Defense and by other Secretaries, but I have not seen a strong statement by the President of the United States saying that he favors these reductions. Until the President of the United States says so specifically I am not willing to take the word of those who say that they are speaking for him, because I have listened to representatives of the President of the United States who have come to the Congress with what they said were his recommendations. The President of the United States later took another viewpoint.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will permit, the President of the United States signed this estimate before it came to the Congress.

Mr. YATES. I should like to point out to the gentleman from Missouri that on the subcommittee on which I am privileged to serve, the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, the President of the United States signed the budget estimates for various agencies. After the Congress had acted differently than the President had recommended the President did not voice any objection. He recommended a public-housing program, for example. When the program was stricken from the bill he voiced no objection. And frequently, some who were assumed to be speaking for the President were later shown not to have spoken with his approval.

Mr. CANNON. The President has sent this estimate down to us and he has given an indication that he supports it in every respect.

Mr. YATES. Let me say that I have not seen such a firm statement made by the President of the United States. Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct my remarks, if I may, to the statement made by my very good friend from Michigan [Mr. FORD] the statement that he made that by voting for last year's appropriation bill I was thereby agreeing with the administration's New Look philosophy. I certainly had no such interpretation—and I am certainly not willing to accept the argument.

Does this same argument hold for the Secretary of Defense?

I call attention to the action of the Secretary in 1953 when he discontinued as a military necessity the construction of a nuclear reactor for an aircraft carrier. Yet, this year, he sent to the Hill a request for a nuclear reactor for an aircraft carrier. I say to the gentleman from Michigan, Why is he not bound by the decision he made 2 years ago? I objected at the time. A few days later an item appeared in the newspaper, the Washington Post and Times Herald, which read:

Construction of an atomic-powered aircraft carrier will be speeded rather than delayed by the Defense Department's cancellation of its carrier project, high officials at the Pentagon said yesterday.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. Of course I yield.

Mr. FORD. I think the situation is quite different. In 1954 when we were considering the budget for fiscal 1955 we had quite a discussion on the floor, in the committee and in the press and all over the country about the so-called New Look. It was well understood that in the budget for fiscal 1955 we were approving the New Look. It was a general philosophy. It was the first time that I have ever heard the idea expressed that by voting "yes," you mean "no," or by voting "no" you mean "yes." I do not understand such an interpretation.

Mr. YATES. Let me tell the gentleman that if I had voted "No" on that appropriation bill I would have been voting for no defense for the United States of America, and I did not want to do that. If I knew that I was supposed to be voting for the New Look principle I would have certainly prepared a motion to recommit, for I oppose that principle, or what I think is that principle, but I do not think that anybody knows what the administration means, yet this is the only alternative the gentleman chooses to give me. But I say I had more choices than the gentleman gave me.

Now may I continue with my own argument for a while and not yield for a few moments?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. YATES was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I think the actions of the Department of Defense under the new administration have

been marked more by pat statements, like the one I cited on the cancellation of the carrier reactor; by public relations phrases rather than by preparation for defense. Suddenly, we find now that we voted for the New Look last year. I did not vote for the New Look, because I do not believe in the New Look. Last year there was developed the new concept of massive retaliation. Now we find a new phrase, the posture of readiness. I assume we will be charged with accepting this idea if we vote for this appropriation bill. I do not accept that argument. I will take the word of those in whom I have confidence, and I respectfully refer you to the statement of General Ridgway, which appears in the report at the bottom of page 19. I respectfully refer the attention of my friend from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to the statement of General Ridgway which appears at the bottom of the page:

The foregoing likewise gives you an idea of why we continue to predict that future war with new weapons may well require more, rather than fewer men, in ground operations.

And that is why I say I am going to support the amendments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because in this world in which we find ourselves it is necessary today that we maintain our Nation's strength. We must try to find peace, and I commend the President of the United States in agreeing to a conference at the summit. But, until we know where we are going, until we can see world tensions really dissipated, we must maintain our strength.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat surprised to listen to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and hear him be so reckless of the truth and having paid so little heed to the testimony that took place before our committee. I tried to get him to yield so I could correct him several times when he insisted time after time telling you that a division in the Army had 15,000 men. Now, if he had listened to or had read the hearings, he would know that 1 of today's divisions has 17,500 men. And, I am quoting his authority, General Ridgway.

Mr. Chairman, there are three top military men for whom I have great respect, General Ridgway, Admiral Radford, and President Eisenhower. While it gives me no satisfaction to find myself differing with General Ridgway, I feel that the decision reached by the President—and the National Security Council—is a proper decision.

After spending hundreds of millions—yes, billions of dollars—for new and modern weapons, better and faster transportation, and advanced communications, if we cannot now reduce the number of men in the Army a modest amount, we have wasted a lot of money.

As has been pointed out, today's division is nearly one-fifth greater in numbers than in World War II. It is more than 80 percent greater in firepower. In other words, fewer men can deliver more death and destruction than a few short years ago. And that increase does

not include any nuclear weapons, which according to General Ridgway would increase the firepower 500 to 10,000 percent—page 81, Army.

Another fact to be remembered when making comparison is that before and during World War II, the Air Corps and the Army was one. Today—to compare, we must take the Army and the Air Force—a total of over 2 million fighting Americans, the biggest military force we ever had without a shooting war going on.

The modest cut will not materially affect our military strength.

Let us see what Admiral Radford said in response to a question I asked. Here are his words, as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

We have today the strongest military forces we have ever maintained in peacetime, and from a purely military standpoint I feel that we are ready to take care of those foreseeable actions which might come short of a general emergency, and we are very well prepared to take care of the initial stages of a general emergency.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said—much will be said—about the massive army Russia has. This is nothing new. They have had that strength since 1945, long before we had any recovery or military buildup in Europe. They could have, almost at will, marched to the English Channel in a few weeks. They did not. With stronger western forces now, they still could—with a little more difficulty—taking a little more time.

The forces the United States has there now is not enough to stop a Russian drive.

Mr. Chairman, we presently have right at 250,000 American civilians in Europe, employees and dependents.

As I pointed out during the Defense Department hearings—page 91—it is just this simple:

If there is danger in Europe and our troops are needed to be immediately available as fighting men, we have no business keeping that many civilians there. If it is safe enough to have a quarter of a million dependents, then we can safely cut down the number of military personnel.

The Austrian Treaty will release 15,000 troops.

Mr. Chairman, it is high time the nations of Europe furnish their proper share of the manpower, and let us bring our young Americans home where they should—and want to be.

Furthermore, with the ratification of the German Treaty, we are now guests in West Germany. Let us not overtax the hospitality of our host.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, the Army is our only military force depending on selective service for manpower. With the increased pay and the reduction to a reasonable size, there is every reason to believe that our Army can be manned, as is the Navy and Air Force, by volunteers.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that facts, logic, and reason support President Eisenhower's recommended reduction in the Army.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph do now close.



The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, interest on deposits, and permanent change-of-station travel, for members of the Army on active duty (except those undergoing reserve training); expenses incident to movement of troop detachments, including rental of camp sites and procurement of utility and other services; expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, prisoners, and soldiers absent without leave, including payment of rewards (not to exceed \$25 in any one case), and costs of confinement of military prisoners in nonmilitary facilities; donations of not to exceed \$25 to each prisoner upon each release from confinement in an Army prison (other than a disciplinary barracks) and to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment; authorized issues of articles to prisoners, other than those in disciplinary barracks; subsistence of enlisted personnel, selective-service registrants called for induction and applicants for enlistment while held under observation, and prisoners (except those at disciplinary barracks), or reimbursement therefor while such personnel are sick in hospitals; and subsistence of supernumeraries necessitated by emergent military circumstances; \$3,679,095,000: *Provided*, That section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932 (5 U. S. C. 59a), shall not apply to retired military personnel on duty at the United States Soldiers' Home: *Provided further*, That the duties of the librarian at the United States Military Academy may be performed by a retired officer detailed on active duty.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Flood: On page 5, line 24, strike out "\$3,679,095,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,823,669,000."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment at the desk.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. May I suggest that the gentleman offer his amendments to the Army en bloc?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman's usual keenness and perception, he knows exactly what I am going to do.

Mr. Chairman, I have at the desk a second amendment dealing with the Army, and since it is a question of budgetary structure, I ask unanimous consent that both these amendments be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Flood: On page 8, line 11, strike out "\$2,831,019,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,936,019,000."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, as you may gather from the two amendments, the first deals with military personnel, the second deals with what we in the committee call M. and O., which is maintenance and operation; hence the joint and total figure.

I should like to say this to my distinguished friend from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] who at one time, many, many years ago, was I believe a captain in the Kansas National Guard and brings us great distinction and military acumen to this bill.

Let me assure you of this. I know how many men there are in a division and I was quoting from the testimony. These interrogations were made by me.

There are two concepts of a division, one 15,000 and one 17,500. And I will settle for the 17,500 because in 5 divisions I would then be short 10,000 men. In the Far East you have 4½ divisions today, and in Europe 5, in the Army; and that is all.

Let me say a word about the atom war, and read to you what the Russians say about atom warfare and the army. I now read to you an article from the New York Times dated April 28. The writer here, Mr. Baldwin, is quoting from Col. F. Gavrikov, who in 1954 wrote in *Sovetskaya Armiya*, the Russian Army paper, about the army and atom war and the numbers of men necessary. That is what the Russian said:

Atom weapons pose certain problems but they are not to be overestimated. Soviet military art assumes that this new means of combat not only does not reduce but on the contrary enhances the part played by the foot soldier and raises his role to a new level.

That is what the Russians think and that is what General Ridgway thinks. In the testimony of General Ridgway there is a new concept of training for the foot soldier. You must deploy him in depth and in breadth over a front 10 times the size of the front in conventional war, and you will need, believe me and believe General Ridgway, and believe the Russian general staff, many times the number of foot soldiers.

Let us talk about the atom weapon in the field, firepower. Much has been made of firepower. Firepower will take the place of the foot soldier. Well, will it? Let me give you the best atomic cannon operation for tactical purposes that you can put in the field. Suppose I agree with you that 1 tactical atomic cannon will take the place of 1 division of 15,000 or 17,000 men. Let us agree to that for this purpose only—1 atomic cannon, 17,000 men.

Now, suppose without consulting you or the gentleman from Kansas the enemy knocks out your atom cannon. Suppose he knocks out your one atom cannon. Then he has knocked out the equivalent of 17,000 foot soldiers. Is that the way you want it? That reminds me of the meat stew of the horse and the rabbit. That makes a great "horsen-pfeffer," 1 rabbit, 1 horse. One cannon is knocked out. In 20 seconds you have lost a division. Is that atomic warfare? That is what General Ridgway does not want, and the Russians do not want it that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MASON. I object, Mr. Chairman, and I serve notice that I will object to every extension until we vote for this bill.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have the deep conviction that we are doing the wrong thing if we make the defense cuts contemplated in this bill. I feel that way because of studying the matter and from the testimony that I have heard on this subject.

I do not think there is any foundation for thinking there are grounds for diminishing the size of the Army. I feel the Army cut which is recommended in this bill is not a cut coming from the Joint Chiefs of Staff or from the Chief of Staff of the Army. I think the cut comes purely and simply as a budgetary matter.

As we sit and stand here today, we have some very heavy responsibilities on our shoulders. In the last 6 or 7 years, we have cut taxes to the extent that if they had not been cut we could balance the budget today and also pay for eliminating this defense cut. That is exactly the situation. It is not that the budget can or cannot be balanced—it is simply that we want to cut taxes. We want to live soft, if you please. We want to have the pleasure of cutting taxes in our time.

I do not think we should have made the tax cuts. We should balance the budget; but more important than that we should have the military strength that this country requires. I think there are few, if any, citizens, throughout the country, who fail to take this philosophy on this bill. They want adequate military strength even if our taxes are high or the budget unbalanced.

There is no such thing in 1955 as a pushbutton war. It was not a pushbutton war in Korea. If it had been possible, President Eisenhower or President Truman would have pushed the button. They both had the opportunity if it had been possible. There was not any evidence before our Committee on Armed Services which would indicate that the foot soldier will not be a man who will play an important and decisive part in any future war, if we do have another in the future.

There, I have laid my heart before you. Please do not make this cut in the Army or in the Marine Corps. The citizens of America do not want these cuts. I do not see how we can face the citizens back home if we tell them we made billions of dollars of cuts in taxes, and at the same time cannot afford the military strength that this country requires.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to deal with two impressions, which I believe could be very dangerous if they were relied upon as the basis for a final conclusion in voting on this amendment for additional Armed Forces. The first impression is one that may have been created by my very able and distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. TABER], for whom I have the greatest respect and greatest admiration. When he told the House that these losses in regular fighting

forces in uniformed soldiers ready to fight were going to be made up for by additional Reserve strength and by additional National Guard strength, I know there was not a Reserve officer sitting in this Chamber who did not have serious misgivings in his mind as he thought about his own Reserve program in which he participates and about its inadequacy to fill the gap that will be created by the loss of the Regular soldier and the Regular marine. The Reserve program is a fine thing. It is a good thing. We should expand it and we should continue to work with it, but let no one be under the misapprehension that a Reserve is as adequate to meet an emergency need of our country as is a man in uniform with gun at his side, because he is not. He will not be as ready, and it will take additional time to get him ready to go into the breach. Mention was made of the very fine National Guard units that went over to Korea and that they did a wonderful thing. They did do a fine thing. They performed heroic service for our country. But those National Guard units, and I speak from personal observation with regard to my own National Guard unit from the State of Oklahoma, had to spend a number of months—a number of very costly months getting combat ready before they could be sent into the breach. We cannot afford that kind of a costly time lag in the event of a national emergency.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just for a question?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. The evidence will show, under my interrogation, that 9 months is the figure that the experts gave to put a division in the field.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

The second misapprehension has to do with a quotation which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] gave from General Ridgway, where he said:

We could beef up the firepower on a percentage basis of our divisions 500 percent, or maybe 1,000 percent, by putting a few of these atomic weapons in the division. They are not in the division today, as you know, sir.

It is true that General Ridgway made that statement. It is true it was given in the hearings, but if you will turn to the top of page 82 and over onto page 84 and read carefully and thoughtfully the statement that General Ridgway submitted in elaboration upon that point, you will find that he made the strong point that this additional firepower was no substitute for manpower, but that on the contrary, experience with additional firepower was that additional manpower was always required from a logistical standpoint and also from the standpoint of having its forces ready to use these weapons and this superior firepower that we have today.

I urge the Members of this House to turn to page 84 and read the supplemental statement that General Ridgway submitted in connection with this statement about beefing up the firepower. I urge that this House enact this amendment and retain the strength of America and decline to gamble with the security of this Nation.

The closing sentence of General Ridgway on page 84 reads as follows:

Reliance on equipment superiority as a substitute for trained battle units, particularly when we are not certain of such superiority, is an unacceptable risk.

We are being asked today, by cutting these forces, to take that unacceptable risk in the viewpoint of the man who is the Chief of Staff of the Army. Let us not go home and tell our folks that we were willing to take "an unacceptable risk" with the security of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

We have heard quite a few discussions on military strategy this afternoon, but in my opinion the expressions from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] most nearly have expressed the viewpoint taken by every one of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in testimony before the Committee on Armed Services early in the year when the matter of the military budget was under discussion. The main justification for a reduction in the appropriations for the Army—and there are reductions in here also for the Marine Corps and for the Navy—was based on a letter which the Secretary of Defense accepted as instructions from the White House on the defense budget for the next fiscal year. In that letter there was a very interesting philosophy expounded. That was couched in these terms:

That because of scientific progress and technological advances we should base our security on military formations which make maximum use of science and technique in order to minimize the number of men.

I would like to tell a very interesting story on that particular point on which all of these cuts are based.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has served long and industriously in this House on the Armed Services Committee. He has the respect of every Member of this House. Mr. KILDAY asked one question through all the hearings held by the Armed Services Committee on the matter of the Defense Establishment budget, and he based it on the one proposition: Do the scientific and technological advances in the field of weapons we are now using and that are coming into being minimize the necessity for increased manpower? He asked that question and directed it point blank to each one of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Unfortunately, only the reply of one, General Ridgway, is in the printed record, because in the other two instances, in the instance of the Air Force and in the instance of the Navy the question and the replies came in executive session.

The answer in each case was that that philosophy is a fallacy, that rather than fewer men in modern warfare there is need for more men.

That is the reason I say that the best presentation I have heard on the floor today on this matter of the 1954 budget for our Defense Establishment has come from the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because before our Armed Services Committee the Joint Chiefs were emphatic

on this point. I do not, of course, serve on the Committee on Appropriations, but from what I have heard here—they must have had the same kind of testimony from the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But I know from the testimony before our committee that the Joint Chiefs considered these reductions in military appropriations dangerous and a risk to our national security. For this reason I must earnestly support and recommend that the House support the position of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. Chairman, the question we are dealing with today is the security of our Nation, the naked issue of whether we will have an Army strong enough to meet our necessary commitments.

The simple, unchallengeable fact that emerges from hearings of the Armed Services Committee is that not a single one of the service Chiefs of Staff is happy about the deep cuts made, apparently for budgetary reasons, in the size of the ground forces, the size of the Army.

We have been told in previous years a lot of nonsense about how we can get stronger by cutting our strength. We have been fed doubletalk about "readjustments" and "greater efficiency" in the use of manpower. When we have raised questions, when we have expressed doubt of the wisdom of cutting our air power or our Navy or our Army then we have been told that it is not our place to dispute the military expert in the White House.

Many of us have been deeply disturbed that balancing the budget has been given priority over maintaining our defenses. We have suspected that reductions were forced upon the Military Establishment out of deference to the Secretary of the Treasury's notion of how much we can afford. With all respect, we strongly doubt the capacity of that gentleman to make such decisions. But when we tried to say so then we were told, "Oh, no, President Eisenhower himself made the decisions, and he is a professional military man, and surely he can be trusted to make sound judgments."

The time has come when we in this body must face our own constitutional responsibilities. We cannot shed these responsibilities, and our accountability to the people, by saying, "Well, General Eisenhower's spokesman said he felt so and so, and who are we to question him?"

Let us marshal the facts.

We made a blunder, and so did the famous military experts whose judgment we were told it was indecent to question, when we made cuts in the strength and force goals of the Air Force. Congress and the administration has since conceded this blunder.

It is not within our province to say that the Executive must spend every penny we authorize and appropriate, whether for the Military Establishment or any other Federal function. But it is within our province to say that we do not consent to a scheduled cutdown of forces. It is our function to say that we think the Executive is unwise in scheduling the cutdown and to authorize stronger forces that the Executive proposes if we think that is wise.



We are paying this year because even the Executive has had to reverse its plans, reconsider its thinking about the Air Force, and start climbing back up toward the goals the renowned expert temporarily abandoned.

Did this back-and-fill performance save the taxpayers any money? There was a theoretical saving of some \$5 billion in the budget, but the waste and inefficiency inherent in a climb-down and climb-back operation made the actual savings invisible.

Now the major issue that we face is the ground forces, the size of the Army, the number of trained and ready combat divisions which can go do the work the foot soldier has always had to do—the slogging and the fighting in the rain and mud until the last enemy is given a choice between a bayonet down his throat and surrender.

We made a mistake on the Air Force. The professional soldier whose wisdom was supposed to be supreme made a mistake and we allowed him to do it. Are we to say that a blunder on the Air Force last year or the year before excuses us in a blunder this year on the Army?

The proposal that comes to us from the administration is that the Army be cut from its December 1954 size of 1,300,000 men to a maximum of 1,027,000 by the end of fiscal 1956.

This is a proposed reduction by nearly 300,000 soldiers, or more than 9 percent, in a period of 18 months, during which there has been and will be no perceptible reduction in the potential missions of the ground forces.

In the Armed Services Committee we asked the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, the civilian secretaries and the individual chiefs of staff whether the mission of the ground forces had been changed, whether there was in prospect a reduction of commitments, to justify so sharp a reduction of strength.

What we got, in reply, was a series of generalized statements that the budget had been prepared in "consultation" with the military men. What we got was a series of statements that the defense chiefs were seeking a balanced level of forces that we could maintain without ups and downs, that we could live with for an emergency variously estimated as possibly lasting for from 10 to 30 or 50 years.

Secretary Wilson told us frankly that after the various approved requests came back from the Bureau of the Budget, the Air Force felt our defense program was good, the Navy and Marine Corps would perhaps like a few additional personnel, but the Army would still recommend higher strength for its active force.

The Secretary was frank, as I said, but he was certainly not guilty of any overstatement. It became perfectly clear, in the public and particularly in the executive hearings, that the Army would very much like what Mr. Wilson euphemistically called higher strength.

The responsible service commanders, to put it bluntly, are not at all sure that the Army will have sufficient ground forces under this program to do its part in putting out brush fires that may flame in the world, defend our Far Eastern and

European positions, and maintain an adequate ready striking force in reserve.

There is some funny business involved in the Defense Establishment total budget for fiscal 1956. There is an overall spending request for \$35.75 billion—but the intriguing suggestion was made to us that maybe, after all, \$1.75 billion would never be spent, that perhaps the actual expenditures would be only \$34 billion.

Secretary Wilson never did explain just how this possible saving would be achieved, except to say that in forecasting big budgets many months in advance some 5-percent margin of error might be expected. But we asked the civilian service chiefs, one by one, how much of that saved \$1.75 billion his own service might contribute, and each of them shied away. Secretary Talbott did not want to give up anything from the Air Force, Secretary Thomas did not want to abandon his Navy budget, Secretary Stevens did not want the Army to have to yield anything more.

There was a little talk of slippages, the inevitable delays in procurement, and there was talk of the redeployment home of some divisions from Korea, and there was talk of greater efficiency in handling manpower. But the service heads were extremely reluctant to agree in advance that they would cut their proposed spending so that Secretary Wilson's intriguing \$1.75 billion savings might be achieved.

Mr. Chairman, is there anyone in this Chamber who does not know that our Army command has been seriously concerned about previous cuts in our ground forces? When there was talk last year of intervention in Indochina, it was common newspaper report that General Ridgway did not believe we could engage in such a project as a clean, immaculate little enterprise costing nothing. There was a danger that we would have to go in on the ground and there was a danger that we would run out of army.

What is the change in world situation that makes it possible to cut our available ground forces by more than 9 percent and still have enough to meet an emergency? There is no change, and Secretary Stevens was unable to define and localize one for us, although he had many opportunities.

All of us have respect for the job President Eisenhower did when he was commanding general of our forces in Europe. But it is permitted to point out that both during World War II and during his term as NATO chief, the ultimate decisions on the size and allocation of forces were not made by him.

He was a theater commander, doing a job with the forces made available to him. The men who decided what forces he should have, or where and how they should be deployed elsewhere, were his military and civilian superiors.

The President wrote to Secretary Wilson on January 5, 1955, a letter outlining his concepts of the Armed Forces, and in this letter he made this statement:

Third, because scientific progress exerts a constantly increasing influence on the character and conduct of war . . . we should base our security on military formations which make maximum use of science and

technology in order to minimize numbers of men.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] quoted this statement to spokesmen of the three services in turn, without disclosing the author, and asked each whether he agreed. Mr. Speaker, not one of the service representatives agreed with President Eisenhower that scientific progress allowed us the pleasant luxury of thinking we can fight any future conflicts without men, or with just a few men.

Secretary Stevens said:

My own view . . . is that these scientific advances and improved weapons do possibly justify some smaller total personnel.

But, he said:

I don't think we have gone far enough to have an absolute answer. I don't think that has been definitely proved by any means up to the present time.

General Ridgway agreed that in a total war the overall strength of the Army might be smaller than in World War II. But we must think of defense now, he said, in terms of a combat zone 150 or 200 miles in depth, in which we must meet hostile air and troop attacks by speedy mobilization, dispersal and redeployment. "It is my reasoned judgment," he declared, "that the integration of new weapons into combat formations will require a given structural force, a field army of certain size," to have "more rather than less men."

This was not the Army viewpoint alone. Neither the Air Force nor the Navy spokesmen agreed that scientific progress had advanced to such a point that the Army could get along with fewer men. They did not know when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] quoted the President's statement, and asked them about it, with whom they were taking issue. But not one of them, in any case, agreed.

When Secretary Stevens later appeared before the Committee on Appropriations, according to the printed testimony, he said that he and General Ridgway differed slightly on the question of new weapons and more or fewer men. But General Ridgway repeated his analysis as he had given it to the Armed Services Committee—that guided missiles and other new equipment require more maintenance men, not fewer, that troops must be more widely dispersed, that there is still a need for soldiers. He did not set himself up in defiance of the constitutional Commander in Chief, but he honestly asserted his own opinions on the military requirements.

Is it not a strange thing that in executive session there was not a single service professional, a single ranking spokesman for the armed services, who would as an expert express his support for the Army cuts imposed by order of the White House?

We learn from General Ridgway that the Army had just completed its plans to cut its strength for 1956 to 1,173,000 men—a bottom platform that Ridgway believed from the program of last year would remain stable—when he got or-

ders to cut some more. He was directed by Secretary Wilson to reduce the Army to 1,100,000 by June 30 of this year and to slash it by another 73,000 next year.

We are past the period, happily, when we can be told that we get stronger by cutting strength. Secretary Stevens did not pretend that an army of 1,027,000 men could do everything that an army of 1,300,000 could do. A onetime Republican presidential nominee, Alf Landon, of Kansas, exploded the strength-through-weakness theme in speeches both last year and this. At Manhattan, Kans., on March 31, 1955, Landon criticized the Defense Department and Congress for failing to provide for enough trained young engineers, for a reservoir of brains to match the Soviet output. On June 15, 1954, he said:

The United States should abandon its plans to cut its Army from 20 to 17 divisions and add at least another 5 or 10 divisions.

Still, here is this proposal to cut the Army again by more than 9 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I say very seriously today that the administration has not made a case for such a reduction.

I say most solemnly that we must pay heed to our own duty, to provide for the national defense, and that we should urgently declare our belief that the commander in chief should reconsider his recommendations.

His judgment is not supported by the judgment of the military men who bear individual responsibility for our strength. It is not sufficient for us to accept a statement that General Ridgway is "parochial" when in fact Ridgway's apprehensions about the size of the Army are shared by other service experts.

All of us abhor war, all of us pray that our soldiers shall never have to fight again in some far corner of the world. But we are a nation with grave responsibilities, and the way we meet them may decide the fate of our own country.

The Army has already taken a tremendous share of the budget cuts for the Military Establishment. Secretary Stevens said that from 1953 to 1956 the Army was swallowing 76 percent of the reduction in Defense Department expenditures.

It is proposed that we now cut our Army by 9 percent more at a time when we have no adequate Reserve program to take up any slack. In all honesty we know that such a Reserve program is not going to spring into existence overnight. But first they want to slash the Army and then look around for the Reserves. And I say again that the administration has not made its case. It is so easy to cut, to slash, to tear down—and so very hard to build up.

Mr. Chairman, we do not yet live in a period of "pushbutton" war, when men safely protected from the heat of battle can run fabulous machines and preserve the country. We still need an army. We still need ground forces to do the jobs ground forces are made to do.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the House thoroughly understands what is sought to be accomplished by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsyl-

vania. I do not think he informed the House, but this is the objective and this is the purpose of it: He proposes to increase the end strength in July 1956, as far as the Army is concerned, to 1,114,000 men.

The committee, following the recommendation of the Department of Defense, fixes the end strength at 1,027,000 in July 1956. So the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is to increase the ground strength of the Army by 87,000 men. Is not that the purpose of your amendment?

Mr. FLOOD. I will answer if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. I am sure the great chairman of our great committee does not mean to misconstrue the facts.

Mr. VINSON. On the contrary, the end strength of the Army on June 30, 1955—

Mr. FLOOD. I said 1956.

Mr. VINSON. I am stating what it is in 1955.

Mr. FLOOD. May I answer? On June 30, 1955, it will be 1,114,000 men. All I want to do is to assure that on June 30, 1956, we will have exactly the same number of men. I do not want to increase it any.

Mr. VINSON. The result of the gentleman's amendment will be to increase the ground strength over the recommended number of men by 87,000.

Last January when the budget was submitted to the committee, as chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services and after consultation with the members of the committee to keep conversant with the armed services appropriations and its strength, I opened hearings and had General Ridgway, Admiral Carney, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the proper officials there, together with Mr. Wilson, the Secretary of Defense. We had a long hearing. I had some conferences with them in executive session. After the testimony it was concluded that a reduction to an end strength of 1,027,000, as carried in this bill, did not imperil the security of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I have been here a long time and I have fought year in and year out for increased appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. But the facts in this case do not warrant approval of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I am going to vote against it.

When I talked to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, when I spoke to Admiral Carney and to all of the officials involved, I had no hesitancy last January in saying that they were on sound ground. I believe they are on sound ground and I am going to support them. I am not going to come in here and say that the security of the Nation is in peril because, in my opinion, it is not in peril at all.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman's opinion be changed in any way if the

bill to come up next week were not passed?

Mr. VINSON. Not one particle at all. We have today, as I stated, the strongest Army, the strongest Navy and the strongest Air Force in the history of this Government. As every Member of this House knows, I have fought for increases for almost 40 years. I am happy this afternoon to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] because this is one of the few times in my career that I find myself and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] agreeing. Many times I have been trying to do exactly what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is trying to do today. But I would not be true to my own convictions if I did not advise the House, as far as my personal views are concerned. The position of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the committee's position, are sound, the position of the Defense Department is sound. The security of this Nation is not being imperiled at all.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendments and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate here today. It would appear to me that members of the Appropriations Committee have arrogated to themselves the functions of the Armed Services Committee. I, too, was quite disturbed when this cutback was proposed for the personnel of the armed services. My chairman, who is here at this time, will agree with me that as a member of the Armed Services Committee I have always taken a vigorous position in support of the ground forces and I know there is no question in the mind of any member of the committee as to where I stand so far as ground forces are concerned. The ground forces are the boys who go through the cold and heat, the filth and fatigue, the misery and mud of mechanized warfare. They have turned in, over the years, in all wars, a magnificent and outstanding performance of which they can well be proud. I am strongly in support at all times of the ground forces, let that be understood. However, I have a great deal of respect and admiration for the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services who after 42 long years of service in the House and as chairman for many years of the Armed Services Committee, his word and judgment are to be respected. He is a man of great experience and eminently qualified to submit to us his opinions and thinking as to positions to be taken on this matter.

I resent deeply the implication that any decisions have been reached in this matter for economic reasons or to balance the budget. That is utterly ridiculous. It is a statement that should not



have been made. The patriotism and integrity of the men who serve on the Committee on Armed Services are challenged. The patriotism of men like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is challenged. A man who, after 42 years of service in the Congress of the United States, is qualified to determine and recommend what should and should not be done. Let me say for my distinguished and able chairman, that at no time has he ever attempted to cut back any branch of defense but his efforts have always been to build and create without question the greatest defense program and the greatest defense setup that this Nation has ever had. He needs no defense from me. His record, I might say to the Members of this House, speaks for itself. He is a great American and his opinions are to be respected.

I would like also to refer for a moment to my good and able friend, the gentleman from Maryland, General DEVEREUX, of the Marine Corps and a member of the Armed Services Committee. He is here today and his brilliant record as a Marine Corps general in World War II eminently qualifies him to speak on behalf of the Marine Corps.

Reference has been made here today to the Chief Executive of the United States; our Commander in Chief, who stated in a letter to the Secretary of Defense, and I quote:

As a goal, I suggest a strength of the order of 2,850,000—with any future material reductions dependent upon an improved world situation. To reach such figures without injuring our combat strength will require continuing close scrutiny of all defense elements, with particular emphasis on administrative overhead.

Now, I might say to the Members of the House that the Commander in Chief is schooled in the art and technique of war; a man who led our forces to victory in World War II; and whose brilliant record since entering the White House has won for him the respect and admiration of the American people. We should be thankful we have a man of his character, experience, and ability to lead us at this critical time in a chaotic world.

I am willing to stand on his judgment because his wide experience in world affairs qualifies him to recommend to us that which he thinks should be done. It is my opinion that we should take the considered judgment of these experienced leaders at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, speaking in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], I feel I would be remiss in my duty to America and the free world if I did not join the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING], the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], in vehemently protesting what is proposed at this time. The situation today, my

friends, is reminiscent of a situation in the postwar days. Let me go back, if you will, to 1949, when former President Truman appointed my distinguished fellow citizen, Louis A. Johnson, of Clarksburg, W. Va., to the post of Secretary of National Defense. We had a proposal at that time similar to your proposal today, and that was to go on an economy drive. The Members who are discussing this amendment today, the members of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services, at the end of 1 year of Mr. Johnson's tenure of office, praised him loudly from this floor for saving \$2 billion in defense expenditures. That was fine. Yet, a few months later the Korean emergency broke, and we found that we did not even have shells for what few cannon we had, and the same gentlemen, both Democrats and Republicans, who had been praising Secretary Johnson of the National Defense Establishment denounced him roundly from this floor and forced him from public life. Now, I am saying to you that Mr. Wilson and the staff at the Pentagon are guessing just like Mr. Johnson and his staff guessed. They may be wrong just like Mr. Johnson was wrong. If that is true, that will be bad indeed for Mr. Wilson, but it will not be good for the defense of this country and the free world to continually keep on guessing and guessing wrong.

I want the RECORD to show that at that time our present President, Mr. Eisenhower, testified in favor of the economy program. He was also for a time military adviser to Secretary Johnson on how best to make these economies.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be pointed out in opposition to this amendment that on page 5 of the Department of Defense hearings for fiscal 1956 the President of the United States is on record in favor of this budget with the manpower and personnel strength recommended by this committee. It should also be pointed out that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford; General Twining; General Shepherd, the Commandant of the Marine Corps; and Admiral Carney are all in substantial agreement with this budget. It should also be pointed out that this dollar amount and the strength figures as proposed here today were approved by the members of our Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, with one exception. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] objected.

Our committee has approved the strength figures and the dollar figures as they were submitted, with minor dollar reduction as set forth in the committee report.

One more point. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] has brought up the fact that prior to Korea the Congress took certain action in reducing the military appropriations. The record shows that the Johnson Defense Department budget in 1950 was \$13 billion for all 3 branches of the service. The so-called Johnson budget for the Army

provided a strength of 590,000. Yes; now we have a Defense budget of \$31.4 billion and an Army strength as of a year and one-half from now of 1,025,000 men—twice as great.

Further, and finally, if the Flood amendment is approved you will have an increase in draft calls on a monthly basis from 10,000 to 20,000. You will also have an additional cost of \$250 million in 1 year. I might add that the gentleman's amendment only provides, however, for an increase of 40,000-plus, rather than the 89,000 that the gentleman thinks he is talking about, because mathematically a cost of \$5,500 per man times 89,000 comes to \$489 million rather than \$250 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized to close the debate on this amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise with great reluctance to oppose the pending amendment. Had a vote been taken on this before it was announced to the country and the world several months ago, I would have voted against a reduction in our Armed Forces for psychological reasons because we are engaged in a peace offensive and a show of weakness would reduce our effectiveness. But the psychological disadvantages of this reduction have already had their effect and increasing this bill by a quarter of a billion dollars now and restoring 87,000 troops will, in my opinion, not add materially to the strength of our Armed Forces and will have no beneficial psychological effect.

Furthermore, I think that under the circumstances the amendment should not be approved because we will only be providing the money and the chances are that the funds would not be expended.

Furthermore, this addition to our armed strength would not be decisive anyway. If a big war comes next week or next year, nobody who opposes this amendment will need to apologize for his position because an increase of that type in a \$100 billion war would be inconsequential. So I do not regard it as significant from that standpoint.

I am quick to agree that we may be in error in our actions; the figure may be too low, it may be too high. Nobody knows with complete certainty just what we ought to do. But under all the facts and circumstances the majority of the members of the committee have felt that we should go along with this portion of the budget, particularly in view of the fact that the major reductions in manpower have already been made under the new program announced by the President many weeks ago.

I think that on this issue we should stand in support of the President's program and in support of the position of the majority of the members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

The amendments were rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The amount available in the Army Stock Fund is hereby reduced by \$700 million, such sum to be covered into the Treasury immediately upon approval of this act.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: On page 12, lines 4 and 5, after "\$700 million", strike out "such sum to be covered into the Treasury immediately upon approval of this act" and insert, "of which sum \$400 million shall be covered into the Treasury immediately upon approval of this act, and \$300 million shall be covered into the Treasury no later than December 31, 1955."

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there will be any question or controversy about this language. The bill provides \$700 million be taken from the Army stock fund and placed back in the Treasury. We have found since the bill was reported that the Army simply will not have \$700 million to put into the Treasury as of that specific date, so we are asking that the money be divided into two payments, \$400 million to go into the Treasury immediately and \$300 million to go into the Treasury not later than December 31, 1955. This appears to be a workable sort of arrangement.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Florida has discussed this amendment with me. I wholeheartedly endorse the amendment, and believe the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] likewise concurs in the amendment.

Mr. SIKES. The committee is unanimous on this amendment, Mr. Chairman. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 12, add after line 5 a new section to read as follows:

"No part of any appropriation in this act shall be used to pay rent on space to be used for recruiting purposes; and no part of any appropriation in this act may be used for pay and allowances of military personnel assigned to recruiting duty in excess of 50 percent of the amount expended for such purposes during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in 1952 I offered a similar amendment to the defense appropriation bill, except that at that time the amendment called for spending no more than 25 percent of the amount that was expended the previous year for recruiting purposes. The amendment at that time also prohibited the use of any funds for paying rent on any space for recruiting service.

I am not a military strategist. I think I can talk about something here that everyone can understand. I do not think any of us can say with any certainty how much money we need to spend for the actual defense. When we are talking about billions for defense I think we are getting into something that is away over most of our heads.

I think in this particular instance, I am talking about something that we see every day, the apparent waste that is

going on in our recruiting service. In almost every county in the United States, you will see recruiters of the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, and the Marines and the WAC's all driving around in separate cars and in some cases they have separate buildings for recruiting headquarters. In the report, you will find there is set aside here more than a half million dollars to pay rent on facilities for recruiting. In every town of any size at all, there are facilities that may be used for recruiting without the Government having to pay one cent in those cities, towns, or villages. I think that that item can be eliminated entirely and we could use existing Government-owned facilities. As to the recruiting service itself, I think most of us believe, or at least many of us believe, that through the Selective Service we have, perhaps, the most effective service for recruiting that we could have. I cannot give you the figure, and I doubt if anybody else can give you the figure as to the number of men who go into the so-called career services. I am speaking of the Navy, Air Force, and Marines. They go there and volunteer their services. They are not recruited, they are not sold the idea of entering the service, but they go there because they know that the draft is blowing down on their neck. They go and sign up for a longer term of years. I think General Hershey of the Selective Service made the statement that his organization could save around \$40 million a year by letting them do this work. This budget calls for more than \$44 million for recruiting service. It is an increase over what we spent last year. I think that with the reduction in force, which it seems we are about to adopt, we will get an adequate force by adopting the amendment which I present to you, which this House adopted, or at least a similar amendment, in 1952. It will result in a saving of several millions of dollars, and it will not disrupt the recruiting service. If you will refer to the hearings of this year and last year or the year before, I defy any Member of the Congress, including members of the Committee on Appropriations, to correlate the figures and have anybody show you how much this recruiting is actually costing in the different services. Another thing, if you turn to the bill which we have before us today, we find on page 7, referring to the Army just two words setting forth, "recruiting expenses." It does not say how much. When we turn to line 13 referring to the Navy, they do not call it recruiting service, but they call it "procurement of military personnel." If you turn to page 25 dealing with the Air Force, they refer to it as "recruiting advertising expense." On page 27, they add "meals for recruiting parties," and "rations for applicants for enlistment." These items are not set up specifically anywhere, but I think by just taking a percentage cut, we will be able to save not less than \$10 million by the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Does the gentleman's amendment make a reduc-

tion of 50 percent in all recruiting costs of the Army, Navy, and the Air Force?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. All of them together; yes.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. In other words, it is blanketing the entire thing?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes; it blankets them all together and provides that we spend no money to pay rent on other buildings because all of this work can be carried on in public buildings which we own, on which we are already paying rent, or where they have available facilities at courthouses and other places where the work can be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise briefly in opposition to the amendment. Its purpose, of course, is commendable. Our committee has always given considerable thought to the expense of recruiting. At first blush it might seem that with the draft law we could fill the forces without recruiting anybody. However, experience has shown that the volunteer is desirable wherever you can get him. At the present time, as I understand it, the Air Force and the Navy are operating entirely on volunteers. You get volunteers better if you bring the story to young people and encourage them.

The testimony also shows that the monthly quotas of draft have been reduced sharply because of the number of enlistments and, very encouragingly of late, the number of reenlistments. Our committee last year learned of—in fact, some of us sought to block a program, whereby the Air Force separated and apparently duplicated, to some extent, recruiting activities that formerly had been made by the Army and the Air Force jointly. We were interested and pleased to find out this year that both the Army and the Air Force found that that separation and in some cases duplication of service, had actually been desirable. It saved money in this way: It has been brought out time after time how important it is to get trained members of the service to reenlist. I think my colleagues on the committee will agree that the showing made this past year by the various services, as to the results of their recruiting programs, were the most gratifying we have had in recent years. Because of that fact, because of the importance of making the service as attractive as possible to young men, and getting young men who want to make it a career, I believe it would be unwise right now, at the time when the program is beginning to show better results, to suddenly cut down the amount appropriated to do. For that reason I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman mentioned the fact that the Air Force and the Navy were receiving volunteers. You would not want to leave the impression that they are not taking other men of the same age group who are subject to the selective service, would you?



Mr. MILLER of Maryland. No. Of course we all realize that many volunteers are perhaps encouraged by the fact that there is a draft law standing behind them and that would make them more willing to enter the service of their choice.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think it might be well to point out that a great percentage of the men who enlist in the Air Force and the Navy are under the draft age.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. A great many are. In any case, I am sure the gentleman will agree that it is a healthy thing to have as many volunteers in all services, whether they are encouraged to volunteer or not.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. What do you think about the payment of rent to the point of a half million dollars a year? Do you think that is necessary?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I am not prepared to say it is not. The justifications before our committee indicated that reasonable economy was being practiced in the program.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I would like to point out that if H. R. 5297 scheduled for debate next week becomes a law, all young men 17 years of age will have to go to recruiting stations to volunteer for 6 months of training in one of the services, as provided for by the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Of course, there are many things accomplished at recruiting stations other than just signing up young men. It would be dangerous on short notice to radically alter this program without much more study than we are able to give it here and now.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from Maryland has stated the case very well indeed. Rent is not paid except in those areas where no Government space is available in post offices and Federal buildings.

The other question involved is the use of personnel for recruiting service. May I point out that the most expensive man we have in uniform today is the 2-year draftee. It is through the recruiting service that we get the career man, the man who stays in the service long enough to become a skilled technician or a skilled weapons man and who knows his job and is able to teach it to others. That is the man we are reaching through the recruiting service.

This is not a new question, we have it before us many times. I assure you there is no justification for any reduction such as proposed by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In view of the statements made by the gentleman from Maryland and the gentleman from

Pennsylvania about effecting economies, and in spite of those statements the gentleman is supporting a \$200,000 increase in rent this fiscal year over the last fiscal year and proposing to spend over half a million dollars for rent alone, yet everyone knows with your armories, your Reserve training centers, post offices and other Federal buildings, and courthouses there is absolutely no need for this increase for rent.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to agree with the gentleman, but the testimony shows that there is not available space; and as the gentleman knows, rents are going up.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to suggest for the consideration of the gentleman proposing the amendment that even though there is an increase requested, yet it is cheaper to spend money on the recruiting program, for it is through that program we get our career men. Further, the Marine Corps have filled all their requirements through the recruiting service. It certainly is not a waste of money.

Mr. SIKES. I believe it has been through the recruiting service at least in part that sufficient interest has been aroused in enlistments to permit the present very low draft quotas.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in spite of the fact that the membership would like to vote very quickly upon this amendment, I do not hesitate to take sufficient time to point out certain information that has not been brought out.

I do not understand that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] asked to cut out recruiting. As the ranking minority member of the committee which handles the appropriation for the Selective Service, my immediate reaction to this amendment was that it was a very good amendment.

Who says this comes so suddenly upon us? For 2 years my subcommittee has been bringing it to your attention and has been saying that this is an extravagant and unnecessary expenditure of money.

The gentleman from Missouri is not cutting out recruiting. Who says the gentleman from Missouri is cutting out recruiting? He is arguing against cutting out recruiting. But he says you ought not to increase the amount spent for recruiting; keep it down to a reasonable amount. I rose when he was speaking and asked him to yield to me solely to call his attention to the fact that the money which is involved in this bill is not the amount of money spent by the Army altogether, or the Air Force, or the Marines to get recruits. Men are assigned to that work, automobiles are used for that work, and time is taken for that work which does not appear among the budget items of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force as recruiting service; in fact, the amount spent is a great deal more than is indicated by the gentleman from Missouri.

Let me say further that this question has been a matter of concern to both the Appropriations Committee and the legislative committee. The big question, of course, that arises is: Is it necessary that we should increase the expensive downtown rentals in order to make it possible for these men to select the service they want to go in, when General Hershey is acting as the beaters used to act for European hunters? They beat the game into the park where the hunters stood. General Hershey beats these men into the offices where they can enlist.

It seems to me we should be sensible about this. My own reaction is to vote for the amendment. The only possible objection I can see to it is that we do not know at this moment whether a 50-percent reduction is right because of contracts or leases which may be actually signed nor do we know how much money is actually being spent. Having tried for several years to correct this through another subcommittee, I for one, intend to vote for the amendment as I hope other Members will, knowing that the money will still be more than enough. The service is not fully accounted for in the appropriation bill before us. If there are minor details like leases they can be ironed out in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FLOOD) there were—ayes 106, noes 68.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, clothing, permanent change of station travel (including expenses of temporary duty between permanent duty stations), training duty travel of midshipmen paid hereunder, and transportation of dependents, household effects, and privately owned automobiles, as authorized by law, for Regular and Reserve personnel on active duty (except those on active duty while undergoing Reserve training; midshipmen of the Naval Academy, and aviation cadets, \$2,486,109,900.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD: Page 12, line 18, strike out "\$2,486,109,900" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,541,109,900."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have a series of amendments that technically I must present. Since they are supporting amendments and they involve the Navy and the cut in the Navy, I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. FLOOD:  
On page 13, line 20, strike out "\$83,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$85,700,000."  
On page 14, line 4, strike out "\$616,438,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$673,667,500."  
On page 14, line 15, strike out "\$286,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$292,750,000."  
On page 15, line 5, strike out "\$172,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$187,750,000."  
On page 18, page 4, strike out "\$779,685,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$802,825,000."

On page 20, line 11, strike out "\$62,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$63,600,000."

On page 22, line 2, strike out "\$295,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$299,400,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask if the gentleman would tell us just what, in effect, all of these amendments accomplish. I think I know, but I think the membership would like to have it.

Mr. FLOOD. The result will be to restore 8,300 men.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. In the Navy?

Mr. FLOOD. In the Navy.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. That is independent of the Marine Corps?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct. Eight thousand three hundred for the Navy, independent of the Marine Corps, and restores 66 ships; in other words, from 1,001 as provided in the budget to 1,067.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Those are landing craft, and so forth. Now, what does it do to the Marine Corps?

Mr. FLOOD. Now I have a problem, and I would like to reply to that. I had a series of amendments on the desk to cover the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, but I did not know anybody else was going to introduce a Marine Corps amendment. However, now my friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] tells me he has an amendment on the desk to restore the cut in the Marine Corps. I had no idea that he did have. Now, I do not know where that leaves me, except he is my senior on the committee, and I give you one guess where it leaves me. I did not know it was there.

However, let me tell you this, because I am sure the gentleman from Alabama does not have the figures which I spent some time getting together.

In the Marine Corps military personnel there will be a 22,000 restoration, and the expenditure \$57,229,500. Marine Corps procurement, \$6,250,000, and then for facilities, which must also follow to support the procurement program—if you have one, you must have the other—\$15 million.

The Marine Corps amendment to restore 22,000 men to give us the 215,000 that General Shepherd asked for will be in amount \$78,479,500. That is my Marine Corps amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. The gentleman's amendment would add eight-thousand-and-some personnel to the Navy, 22,000 Marines, and would add the group of landing ships that he referred to; is that correct?

Mr. FLOOD. No; may I correct the gentleman in this wise. My amendments read en bloc do not include the Marine Corps at all.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. They did as they were read by the Clerk. That is why I asked the question.

Mr. FLOOD. I am glad to have them included at this point but I did not intend, and thought I had made it very clear, to have the Marine Corps included at this time; I wanted my amendments

considered that were concerned only with the Navy and not the Marine Corps.

Mr. Chairman, in order to clarify the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that my amendments, which are a series of technical amendments dealing only with the Navy and not with the Marine Corps, be read at this time.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. The gentleman wishes to have considered at this time only his amendments dealing with the Navy proper?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct; with the Navy proper.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] indicate to the Chair specifically the amendments that are included in his last unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Pennsylvania always abides by a suggestion from the Chair, and at this time, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendments dealing with the Navy proper be read en bloc, without including any amendments I may have at the desk dealing with the Marine Corps.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman advise the Committee how many ships his amendment would bring out of mothballs?

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, I do not want them to go into mothballs; but if they did, my amendment would bring out 66.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Chair will direct that the Clerk report the amendments that are now offered en bloc by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] dealing solely with the Department of the Navy.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. FLOOD:

Page 12, line 18, strike out "\$2,486,109,900" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,541,109,900."

Page 13, line 20, strike out "\$83,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof, "\$85,700,000."

Page 18, line 4, strike out "\$779,685,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$802,825,000."

Page 20, line 11, strike out "\$62,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$63,600,000."

Page 22, line 2, strike out "\$295,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$299,400,000."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. In view of the unanimous-consent request pending, is it understood that these sections will be considered as having been read?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] that no request has been made that these sections be considered as having been read.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Navy title and Marine Corps title in the bill be considered as having been read and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] that the amendments just reported be considered en bloc?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, in view of my efforts here all day in connection with the restoration of these cuts, I intend to ask recognition on the Marine Corps amendment as soon as this is disposed of.

Mr. Chairman, this cut in the Navy does not deal with many men. My amendment will restore 8,300.

Please let me make it clear again, and I repeat this for the purpose of emphasis, I am not desiring to increase anything, men, material, or ships. This amendment will prevent the Navy from putting into mothballs 66 ships. These are not the spit-and-polish, magnificent things you see in the newsreels coming down New York Harbor into your lap on cinemascopes; no, no. These are not magnificent flattops and great battle cruisers and great battle wagons; no. These are all amphibious craft that the marines must have to fight a war.

A great play is being made about saving the dollars and putting the fleet into mothballs. This is not that case. This is part of a deal, again, to make the marines policemen. I think I heard that once before some place. Please believe me.

The answer will be from somebody, for instance, Admiral Carney, that these ships—these are not ships, these are boats; there is quite a difference—can be restored into active duty in 30 days. If the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations from Missouri is right—and he has always been right, in my opinion, until today—I never thought I would live long enough to see the gentleman from Missouri in error; however, he tells us today, and he speaks as ex cathedra, that the war will last only a few days. If the gentleman from Missouri is right, then Admiral Carney is wrong, because Admiral Carney and the ships or the boats or nobody else in the event of war will be here in 30 days to get these amphibious boats, these small craft, or take them out of mothballs.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot have this thing both ways. You cut the Army. Now you are going to fool yourselves. You are going to go back and tell your districts what a great economy day this was for the taxpayers. You put 66 ships into mothballs. Do not say that in my district, because I will tell them what happened. You know better; and if you do not, I am telling you. It is a sham. You are doing nothing of the kind. This is part of the Marine Corps cut.

Let me add this: If you cut the Army—and you have cut it—what do you have left? The Air Force and the Navy. This atomic war, all these authorities that spoke all day tell you, is to be an Air Force and a naval war. So you cut the Army. Now you have a naval war



and an Air Force war; so now, consistency being a beatitude, you are going to cut the Navy. You are going to wind up with the Air Force of the gentleman from Missouri before you get through.

Why do you want to cut the Navy? Why under the sun, Mr. Chairman, do you want to make this cut in the Navy this afternoon? Why do you want to do it?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman is a soldier, but I will listen to him. What does he have to say about the Navy?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I think the Navy is a very fine organization.

Mr. FLOOD. Now we agree.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. But is it not a fact that no witness of any sort appeared before our committee that opposed this reduction in the Navy, even Admiral Carney?

Mr. FLOOD. If Admiral Carney had opposed this cut, he would have been fired, just as they are going to fire General Ridgway for opposing the cut. I guess he did not want to be fired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the Members I am not going to take a great deal of time because I am just as tired as all the Members are. We were presented with the same situation with reference to the Army and we have the same objection in this instance. I hope these amendments will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood].

The amendments were rejected.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I have several amendments at the desk and I ask unanimous consent that they may be read and considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ANDREWS:  
On page 14, line 4, strike out "\$616,438,000" and insert "\$673,677,500."

On page 14, line 15, strike out "\$286,500,000" and insert "\$292,750,000."

On page 15, line 5, strike out "\$172,750,000" and insert "\$187,750,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Andrews].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make it clear that after all of my talking here today I had an amendment for the Marine Corps on the Clerk's desk where it has been all day, and I would like the House to know what the situation is at this minute.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I offered these amendments in the subcommittee for Navy and also in the subcommittee for defense. The purpose of these amendments is to increase the Marine Corps strength from the present budget by 13,000 officers and men. At the beginning of this fiscal year, the strength of the Marine Corps was 223,868 officers and men. By the end of this

fiscal year 1955 the strength of the Marine Corps will be 205,000 officers and men. Under the budget before the House today, the size of the Marine Corps at the end of the fiscal year 1956 will be 193,000 officers and men, or a reduction since the first of this fiscal year of 30,868 officers and men. The amendments I have offered will keep the strength of the Marine Corps through fiscal 1956 at the same size it will be by the end of fiscal 1955, namely, 205,000 officers and men. I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, from having sat through about 3 months of hearings that this budget is sufficient to give us the power to carry out the purposes of our Defense Department. I am convinced from having heard testimony for over 3 months that the purposes of this budget can be accomplished. What is the purpose of this budget? In the event of an all-out worldwide war to be in a position to retaliate against our enemy quickly and completely. If we get into a war in the next year or 2 years, and no one knows whether we will or not, it will be 1 or 2 types of war. It may be an all-out war which, as our chairman says, may not last but a few days, and, if that is so, we may not need this additional strength in the Marine Corps.

The other type war we may find ourselves in is the so-called brushfire war. There is where the Marines come into the picture. I do not have to stand here and tell you about the glorious past history of the Marine Corps, but I say to you that the cost of these three amendments will be about \$78 million, and it will enable the Marine Corps to retain 13,000 officers and men. General Shepherd told our committee in response to a question I asked him that he would be glad to have these men; that he could use these men, and if he did not get these men he would have to discharge some of the marines he has today.

We are not drafting men into the Marine Corps. The only way men go into that great outfit is by volunteering. The issue is clear. I will not take any more time. I think there is need for at least 205,000 officers and men in our Marine Corps. That is what these amendments do. I hope you will see fit to vote for these amendments, and keep the Marine Corps at the same strength through next year, which it is today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I would like to call attention to the fact that you have the same situation to the degree that you had with the other two amendments. You just rejected the Flood amendment which placed ships in moth balls, and if this amendment is agreed to you would have to go back and flood the ships. Now, we have a balanced program and if we are going to keep it in balance there is only one logical thing to do and that is to vote as you did on the Flood amendments in connection with the Navy.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment is defeated, the strength of the Marine Corps will still be two and one-half times what it was prior to Korea.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Flood as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS: On page 14, line 4, strike out "\$616,438,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$673,677,500."

Amendment offered by Mr. Flood as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS: On page 14, line 15, strike out "\$286,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$292,750,000."

Amendment offered by Mr. Flood as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS: On page 15 line 5, strike out "\$172,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$187,750,000."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer this substitute for this purpose: My amendment calls for the restoration of a sufficient number of men to the Marine Corps to bring its strength, June 30, 1956, to 215,005 men. That is the figure I asked General Shepherd, the Marine Corps Commandant, to state.

The testimony will show I asked him that direct question in the presence of the Secretary of the Navy and in the presence of Admiral Carney, the commanding officer of the Navy:

General Shepherd, how many men do you think should be in the Marine Corps for this coming fiscal period?

You have wanted authority all day, I am giving you the best authority that can be had, the Commandant of the Marine Corps. He said, "215,005."

Now may I say, Mr. Chairman, that if the membership of this Committee wishes to substitute its individual and collective judgment and be presumptuous, as it has been indicated I may have been today, that all you have to do to disagree with the Commandant of the Marine Corps is to vote down my amendment. I do not see how you possibly, demanding authority, could get more than you have.

Let me quote from General Shepherd:

We will not have the backup, the support, the staying power that we have now. Of course, the imposed limited amphibious shipping will decrease the mobility of the fleet marine forces in the event of a sudden emergency.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of what you have done with the Army, regardless of what you have done with the Navy, you have never in the history of this House failed to support the Commandant and the Marine Corps when the Commandant has said:

This is what I need for the Marine Corps in a sudden emergency to do the job.

Mr. Chairman, you want authority. If you want to be consistent, you voted to cut the Navy because the commanding officer of the Navy asked for it. You cut the Army because the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff asked for it; now, to be consistent, do not cut the Marine Corps, because the Commandant of the Marine Corps asks you not to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHEPPARD: On page 16, after the word "constructed", in line 20, insert the words "or converted."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, this is a committee amendment merely to correct an inadvertence in preparing the draft of the bill. The two words "or converted" were carried in last year's law and should be continued. There was no intent to strike them out. This appropriation covers not only new construction but also conversion of existing ships, so the words are necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV of the bill?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, news accounts of hearings and statements are necessarily condensed versions of what actually occurs. That being so, it may well be that I have reached inaccurate impressions of what certain Members of Congress and others have said with respect to the President's proposal for an atomic-powered ship. I have been much disturbed by the statements they have been reported to have made. The net effect of them, as I view it, has been to throw cold water on the President's idea.

One of the most astounding developments of our time has been the development of atomic energy. The attention of the people of the world has been directed toward the application of atomic energy to military uses. But, I am personally convinced that the people of the world favor the development of such energy to peacetime uses. I firmly believe that every encouragement should be given to the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Statements or acts which discourage such development do a disservice not only to United States citizens but to people of the world generally.

I, for one, am pleased to hear that the Committee of American Shipping Lines favors the President's plan to construct a pioneering model of a nuclear-powered merchant ship. Not only does it encourage development of peaceful uses of such energy, but dramatizes in a most effective way the role of our merchant marine. The atomic ship would capture the imagination of all people, and focuses upon shipping the kind of attention many of us on this committee believe is needed.

Such a ship will serve a practical purpose, and the expenditures involved in constructing it should be viewed in that light. Just as the first jet airplane prototype pioneered the way for present jet flight, so will a nuclear merchant ship show the way for further application of atomic power in at least some of the ships, perhaps, which we have been discussing in connection with the vessel replacement program.

The development of atomic energy uses will without question be rapid. It is conceivable that the experiences with the *Nautilus* will produce atomic-powered propulsion equipment which could be utilized by merchant vessels by the time appropriations are made by Congress, vessel plans are drawn, and a ship hull built.

One of the objections to the building of a nuclear-powered ship which would be exhibited to many people was that only 1 or 2 million people could visit it in a year's time. Perhaps not that many could go through it and inspect it. But many more millions could see it without an inspection routine. Furthermore, countless other millions would be impressed by it without ever seeing it. How many people have seen the *Nautilus*? How many people have gone through or inspected the latest jet planes? Who can say that millions have not been impressed who never saw either? How many persons have actually seen the bomb tests at Yucca Flats? And who would say that these tests have not made an impact on people throughout the world?

The Clerk read as follows:

#### MILITARY PERSONNEL

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation, interest on deposits of enlisted personnel, and travel in kind for cadets and permanent change of station travel for all other personnel of the Air Force of the United States on active duty including duty under section 5, National Defense Act, as amended, or section 252 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (50 U. S. C. 1003) (other than personnel of the Reserve components, including the Air National Guard, on active duty while undergoing Reserve training), including commutation of quarters, subsistence supplies for issue as rations to enlisted personnel, and clothing allowances, as authorized by law; and, in connection with personnel paid from this appropriation, for rental of camp sites and local procurement of utility services and other necessary expenses incident to individual or troop movements (including packing and unpacking and transportation of organizational equipment); ice, meals for recruiting parties, monetary allowances for liquid coffee for troops when supplied cooked or travel rations, and commutation of rations, as authorized by law, to enlisted personnel, including those sick in hospitals; transportation, as authorized by law, of dependents, baggage, and household effects of personnel paid from this appropriation; rations for applicants for enlistment, prisoners of war, and general prisoners; subsistence supplies for resale, as authorized by law; commutation of rations, as authorized by regulations, to applicants for enlistment and general prisoners while sick in hospitals; subsistence of supernumeraries necessitated by emergent military circumstances; expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, prisoners, and members of the Air Force absent without leave, including payment of rewards (not to exceed \$25 in any one case); confinement of military prisoners in nonmilitary facilities; and donations of not to exceed \$25 to each civilian prisoner upon each release from a military prison, to each enlisted man discharged otherwise than honorably upon each release from confinement under court-martial sentence, and to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment; \$3,670,000,000.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

#### WINNING THE WAR OF IDEAS WITH THE AIR FORCE BAND

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, it is generally known that the Communists are past masters in the use of songs and plays and films to change men. Vishinsky in a London speech some 2 or 3 years ago made the statement that "we will win in this battle of ideas, not by the atom bomb but with our superior brains, ideas, and doctrines." I feel we have been greatly deficient in using ideas which we have ready and available. Take, for example, the overseas tour of the United States Air Force Band. In June 1954 the band, under the leadership of Col. George S. Howard, Chief of Bands and Music of the Air Force, led his musicians through 17 countries in Europe, the Near East, and north Africa. The purpose of the trip was to better troop morale, further Air Force communication relations, and to increase the stature of the United States armed services in foreign countries. It did more than that.

As a part of my remarks, I will extend a full statement giving a detailed review of this outstanding mission. As an introduction to this statement, I would like to quote from an editorial that appeared in the *Wesermuender Rundschau* following the August 6, 1953, concert of the band. The editorial ran as follows:

It is a fortunate idea to make an orchestra the ambassador of a nation. What the politicians with their sober minds seldom create, the United States Air Force Band succeeded in doing within a few minutes.

I recall, Mr. Chairman, that I was on an Air Force mission in Paris during August and September of last year. I met a lady in Paris who gave me her personal reaction to the concert that was given by the band in Paris on July 4 when over 25,000 Parisians came out for the concert. She remarked that as these American musicians played the stirring French patriotic songs that had led France to great victories, moral, spiritual, and military, in past history, tears came to her eyes and to scores and scores of others. To her it represented a superior idea, a new America.

How to reach the heart of an individual and a nation must be our mission.

In further support of what I have in mind, Mr. Chairman, I quote from a story that appeared in the *Los Angeles Herald and Express* of April 19. This highly respected newspaper of the west coast referred to Dr. Fadhl Jamali, chairman of the Iraqi delegation and former Prime Minister, speaking at the opening of the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, Indonesia, who called for "moral rearmament as the need of the world today." The news story in the *Los Angeles Herald and Express* concerning Dr. Jamali's complete statement at the Bandung Conference was as follows:

In a strong speech in which he attacked "materialistic religions that breed hatred among classes and people," Jamali said, "We must work on the basis of moral rearmament whereby men of all races and nations with clean hearts and with no rancor or



hatred approach each other with humility and admit our own mistakes, and work for mutual harmony and peace. The world would then turn into one integral camp with no eastern or western camps.

"It is our sincere hope that this conference will prove to be a great moral force for ideological disarmament and moral rearmament."

#### THE MISSION OF THE AIR FORCE BAND

Every American citizen is proud of the United States Air Force—proud of its military record in World Wars I and II, proud of its magnificent contribution to the development of aviation, proud of the fine men and women who constitute its personnel. The Air Force song has taken its place in our folk music with Anchors Aweigh and the Halls of Montezuma and other service songs. Plays and motion pictures and TV performances continually develop the theme of the merits of this branch of our armed services. But there is one activity of the Air Force, not closely related to its functions in the field of military aviation, of which few people are aware, and in my estimation this particular contribution is quite as outstanding as are any of its other better known activities. I refer to the five European tours which have been undertaken by the United States Air Force Band. My remarks on this subject today will be based on the most recent tour of last summer because the story of all five tours would be a very long story indeed.

Secretary of the Air Force Harold E. Talbott has permitted me to use records of the 1954 tour of 17 countries in Europe, the Near East, and North Africa which was carried out by 80 members of the band under the leadership of Col. George S. Howard, chief of bands and music of the Air Force. Colonel Howard arrived in Frankfurt on June 16, 1954, and for the next 2 weeks he was engaged in making preparations for the tours and inspecting Air Force bands stationed in Europe. On June 30 the band played its opening concert in Wiesbaden, and during the next 2 months it carried out a mission which Colonel Howard referred to as a "musical venture in American diplomacy." This was not a vacation nor an easy assignment, but a mission which will bring America and American ideals to the grassroots of 17 countries and many more nationalities. He continued:

Eighty Americans will speak to Arabs, Italians, Turks, Greeks, and Europeans in a language everyone will understand. To many this will be their first contact with Americans. To others it may mean a new concept and a more thorough understanding of our country, because we will break through language barriers, tradition, and custom.

There is every evidence to prove that this particular exercise of diplomacy was highly successful—in fact, I have not heard any sort of adverse criticism from any source to contrast with the high praise so freely bestowed on the work of the band. In spite of this outstanding success I daresay that in our complex modern world we cannot substitute tours of American musicians and other forms of cultural contributions for the entire structure of the State Department as our instrumentality of conducting foreign

relations, but I feel quite certain that much greater use of such methods can and should be made. I know that my belief will be shared by Members of the House if I tell you of only a few events which took place in the 1954 tour of the Air Force Band.

One simple measure of the effectiveness of their mission is an estimate of numbers of persons who saw and heard the band. The total attendance was estimated at a little less than a million persons. The size of certain individual audiences is also striking—Nancy, 50,000; Berlin, in the Olympic Stadium, 70,000; the airport in Berlin, 10,000; Paris, on July Fourth, 25,000; Luxembourg, 40,000; Trier, 30,000; Copenhagen, 60,000; Kaiserlautern, 30,000; Stuttgart, 25,000; Nurnberg, 55,000; Garmisch, 15,000; Naples, 80,000; Athens, 20,000; the Izmir—Turkey—Fair, 70,000; Ankara, 10,000; Beirut, thirty or forty thousand; Tripoli, 12,000; and Alexandria, 10,000.

But statistics do not tell the story as well as do descriptions of a few of the concerts. You probably remember that in the summer of 1954 there were almost daily rainstorms in all European countries. A good test of interest in the Air Force Band's concerts would be the willingness of audiences to come to their concerts, and to stay through them, in the rain.

On July 6 the band was scheduled to play at Fontainebleau. All day it rained, and at 6 o'clock, when it was time to leave Paris for the concert, it appeared that the downpour would never stop. On arrival, the band remained in their transports, and 30 minutes before the concert the rain turned into a drizzle, but still one too heavy in which to perform. There was 7,000 chairs for the audience and 5,000 additional people were standing, all patiently waiting in the rain. At 8:30 General Hale, of the Air Force, arrived with his party, including the Marshal of France. At this time the clouds began to separate, the drizzle ceased, and the concert began only 10 minutes late. The relatively good weather held out for 2 hours, and just as the band was concluding its concert with the playing of the French anthem steady rain set in again.

May I tell just one more story about a concert in the rain, in the words of Colonel Howard, the chief?

July 17.—Dusseldorf was our next stop. Here, we found the weather impossible. The concert had been scheduled for early evening, 7 p. m., but there was no alternate in case of rain. It was not only cold and raining, but the stadium was at the very edge of the city. The Amerika Haus had given out several thousand invitations to schoolchildren. At six, I decided it was practically impossible to even think of giving a concert, but still I did not like to cancel it out at that point. I asked the band to remain at the hotel while I drove to the concert site. On the way there, I noticed many streetcars crowded with people and when I arrived at the stadium, I found 5,000 children seated under the roofed-in portion, waiting for the band. I simply could not let all those children down, so I telephoned for the band to come on out. A half hour later, the men arrived and I placed them in the center of the reserved section in the regular tier seats. There was no place for cellos,

string basses, or music racks. We played a program from memory an hour and a quarter in length and sent the youngsters, plus many adults, home happy. It was a really tough program on the band but I could see no alternative. Had any one of the men been in command, I am sure he would have done the same. I spoke to several of the youngsters and discovered many of them had traveled several hours by streetcar and made as many as two changes in order to attend the concert.

But it did not rain for the concert in Ankara, Turkey. Many persons in the audience of 10,000 drove to the stadium in which the concert was given. The streets were supposed to be sprinkled by the fire department, but shortly before the concert began a large fire broke out and the fire department would not sprinkle the streets around the stadium. As a result, the dust was so thick that it got over everything, the band could hardly see the audience, and breathing became very difficult. But in spite of the dust, the audience and the band stayed at their respective posts. After the first 30 minutes of the concert, the fire department arrived and settled the dust on the streets and parking lots.

Among the very large numbers of people in all countries visited by the band who took an interest in the concerts of the Air Force Band were the Communists. On July 7 the band gave a concert at Evreux, a short distance from Paris, in a lovely park. The audience numbered about 12,000 and this large attendance was attributed in part to the unintentional effect of thousands of handbills distributed by the Communists for the purpose of keeping people from attending. At Nancy there was the same sort of advance publicity from the Communists, but 50,000 persons attended the concert. In Rome the crowd which sought admission to the open-air theater next to the Colosseum was far too large to be accommodated. Some six or seven thousand persons outside the gates listened to the music over loudspeakers. During the first two numbers there were several organized commotion incidents, thought to be Communist-inspired. For the third number the band played "Gopak," by the contemporary Communist composer, Katchaturian. During this number there was absolute silence and it was ardently acclaimed by the audience. It cannot be proved that the Communist composition stopped the heckling, but in any event it did not occur again. Apparently there was some Communist-inspired disturbance during the concert at Beirut in Lebanon.

Colonel Howard planned the programs of his concerts very carefully, and the results demonstrated the value of such intelligent analysis of the interests of widely varied audiences and of the effectiveness of different types of music. I quote Colonel Howard:

The selection of programs were most successful. We gave them what they wanted to hear, what they should hear, and what entertained them. It took real courage to play and announce the composition by a contemporary Soviet Communist composer. The band played with real artistry and captivated the audience from the beginning. Nothing could have been finer. If America could realize the value of this medium, much

money could be saved by a greater support for this medium of improving relations with foreign nationals.

Following the concert in Regensburg Colonel Howard spent an hour with a member of the American Foreign Service, a specialist in Russian language and affairs. He told Colonel Howard that—

The people in Regensburg have never been sold on American procedures and American troops. In 2 hours you have accomplished more and created better relations than we have been able to do in the years I have been here. These relations are my business and I want to tell you that tonight I have seen women walking past your buses after the concert saying "Aufwiedersehn" to your men—women who previously would not even stoop to spit on an American soldier. Tonight you have made American history in Regensburg.

In Naples on the day after a concert attended by 80,000 people, one of the Italian neighbors of an American officer assigned to Naples came to him and said:

You have showed me many pictures of America and told me many stories. I have also read many newspapers, but that is all pro; agenda. I have heard much propaganda during the war from our own Government and I could see it was not true. Russia, also, has many pictures and news releases, but that, too, is propaganda. But last night—that was not propaganda. It was something I understood and it was better than anything I have ever heard. Never again will I question your word about America.

At Naples the city administration gave good evidence of its attitude toward the Air Force Band concert in its expenditure of some \$5,000 to provide overhead lighting, a public-address system, and chairs.

The Marshal of France who attended the concert at Fontainebleau said that he had never heard a finer organization, and he commented on the precision, dynamics, and overall musicianship of the players.

The concert in Hamburg was extremely important because the Soviet-sponsored appearance of the Russian ballet was to be made the next week. Colonel Howard wrote:

To the average American this may have no significance as neither music nor art plays as important a part in our lives as it does in the life of the European. But here the culture of America may be judged on the basis of our performance. While Amerika Haus does a tremendous job of selling America, a concert such as we give reaches more people in 2 hours than the Haus does in a year. The American Consul was very much elated with the whole performance and informed us that real benefit was derived from this Hamburg appearance.

On July 30, the band played in an amphitheater built by Hitler on the top of Holy Mountain near Heidelberg. Thousands of Germans walked to the top of the mountain and it was said that the amphitheater had been filled only once before when the Air Force Band appeared there in 1953. Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn and his wife were in the audience and, in spite of extremely damp, cold weather, they remained for the 2-hour concert. Mr. Kaltenborn who could evaluate the audience reaction was extremely enthusiastic. He told Colonel Howard that he had heard so much about the band's performances that he had come to Hei-

delberg particularly to hear this concert, and he told several reporters that the presentation of the band did more good for European-American relations than all the ambassadors America ever sent over here. Colonel Howard was naturally glad to have the reaction of a man whose opinion is so universally recognized, and he quoted the substance of Mr. Kaltenborn's remarks as follows:

In Berlin there is a very fine boys' choir of 60 voices. I invited this group to appear on our show in a similar manner to the previous year. We had a special arrangement of Berliner Yungens die Sind Richtig (Berlin Children Are O. K.). At the end of our first half of the program, the band played and the "Singing Sergeants" sang the chorus of the song. At the same moment, the 60 boys from the choir, dressed in black velvet suits with short trousers, ran out from the stadium entrance and took their place on the left of the stage. They arrived there just in time to sing the second chorus but this time they sang Berliner Yungens wir Sind Richtig (Berlin Children We Are O. K.). At that same moment the spotlights were turned on the Kinderlift children. The band then left the stage for 12 minutes while the boys' choir performed. As the boys' choir again ran off the stage, the band paraded in (ranks of seven) to resume the program. It made a fast-moving show. Our program again covered the waterfront, from classics to jazz. Twice during the concert the clouds came so low one could hardly see the top of the stadium, but the rain held off until after the performance. I was particularly pleased about this as it gave Secretary Talbott and his party the full benefit of a typical German reception to good music.

I could continue to give you descriptions of concerts quite as interesting as the ones in the Near East and in Berlin, but they would only add strength to the evidence presented in those few examples. I shall conclude by offering you some of the statements and comments concerning the high professional quality of the band's performance and the effectiveness of their concerts in creating international understanding and good will.

The band played at the annual Fourth of July party at the American Embassy in Paris. Both Ambassador and Mrs. Dillon were most enthusiastic about the music, and they assured Colonel Howard that the appearance of the band at the reception was responsible for its success. Old employees of the embassy said that this was the most successful party given at the embassy for as many years as could be remembered.

The band attended a fair held on an international basis in Izmir, Turkey. The fair included a large number of what appeared to be permanent buildings, and the Soviet exhibit of cameras, refrigerators, machinery, furs, electrical equipment, and hundreds of pictures was in a large building surmounted by a red star. Representing the United States was the Air Force Band, and by means of special amplification its music reached everyone at the fair—more people, in all probability, than would have visited an exhibit building in a week. The entire Cabinet of the Government attended the concert, and one Turkish official said that it was the greatest exhibit of the entire fair.

A most unusual audience attended the concert in Tripoli. Colonel Howard described the event in the following words:

Here, the average Arab is very backward and in most cases western music is entirely unfamiliar to him. For these people, an applause of 3 or 4 handclaps is world shaking. True, they gave us that applause, and I must confess no one left the concert until its conclusion, but to look at unemotional faces and to receive the total acclaim of 3 or 4 claps—that is a bit disconcerting for both performers and conductor. But from reports following the concert, it was apparently successful.

Throughout the Near East, Colonel Howard frequently gave a place on the band's program to The Procession of the Sardar, from the Caucasian Sketches, which he described as occupying the same place in their musical literature as the Stars and Stripes occupies in ours.

Colonel Howard's description of the concert in the Olympic Stadium in Berlin presents an audience entirely unlike the Arabs at Tripoli. As usual, the rain which lasted all day made the prospects of playing at night most uncertain. About 6 o'clock the rain ceased, and the band went to the stadium, and at 7:40 Secretary of the Air Force Talbott and his party arrived. Colonel Howard's description of the concert is so excellent that I quote it in full:

At 8 the band played the Air Force March while I entered the stadium in an open sedan, seated on the back of the seat and dressed in Air Force formal (tails and cape). We drove around the track, stopping at the official box to salute the Secretary and General Tunner, then continuing around to the cheers and applause of 70,000 Germans. On arrival at the stage, I dismounted, ascended the podium, and the concert opened with the Ride of the Valkyrie by Wagner. For 2 hours we played. Again, as in former years, we were twice greeted with the greatest ovation given by Berliners—absolute silence, then, almost as if on signal, the flaring of a match from somewhere in the stadium, followed by 70,000 matches, lighting up the whole stadium. What a thrilling sight and tribute.

During the concert, I performed the German marching song Ericka. This was done with glee club and band. It is a lovely song, the words of which start off "In the garden blooms a flower and its name is Ericka." It is cleverly written and, of course, is known by every German. It was written by a composer during the Nazi regime, but has no controversial words. Its only crime is that it was written during the wrong era. My reason for doing it was to show that in a democracy we recognize culture and music for its value alone. We do not forbid the playing of good music because it is written by a Communist, a capitalist, a German, or a Jew. We live democracy; we don't just talk about it. We do not put composers in disfavor, as do the Communists, or as did the Nazis. The reception was tremendous. Every time the word "Ericka" came along, the entire audience shouted it in unison. The following day one paper said we could have done without this number, but I gave a release to the press through our High Commissioner's office as to why it was done. It turned into good propaganda.

At this concert we had as special guests children from the Kinderlift. The Kinderlift is a project of the United States Air Force, originated by General Tunner. Each year the Air Force flies German children from Berlin to West Germany for a 2-week vacation with American families. This is a tremendous morale factor for Berliners. Since the children had already been selected for



this trip, I suggested we have them attend the concert as special guests of the band. Approximately 2,000 attended and were given a reserved section.

In Athens the concert was sponsored by the American Ambassador, and the audience was very select, including ambassadors from every country having an embassy in Greece, and many high Greek officials and military commanders. It was held in an ancient amphitheater close to the Parthenon on a beautiful moonlight night. American Ambassador Cannon said that this was the first time America ever indicated to the Greeks, who pride themselves on their culture and background, that we, too, had a culture. At the end of the concert many other ambassadors expressed their wholehearted gratitude to Colonel Howard, and one of them said, "In 2 hours you have won more good will for America than a million dollars would buy."

One of the last concerts was given in the Bull Ring in the city of Tangier. The American air attaché, Colonel White, told Colonel Howard that the Air Force Band concert had now become the social affair of the year and that anyone not on the invitation list simply did not rate. Requests for tickets far outnumbered available seats, and the audience was extremely enthusiastic.

I daresay that Colonel Howard, however much he may have appreciated such expressions of appreciation as those I have recounted, was most happy at the end of the tour to learn from his superior officers in the Air Force that they were highly pleased with the reports which the American ambassadors, ministers, and generals had sent back about the concerts in their respective cities. General Gruenther told Colonel Howard that in his estimation there is no medium which does more for public relations and he extended his personal thanks to every man in the band, congratulating him on having accomplished a great job. Colonel Howard left for the United States with every reason to believe that he had successfully accomplished a mission of importance in international affairs.

My own remarks can add little to this description of certain aspects of the 1954 tour, because you undoubtedly have drawn the same conclusions that I have. No one can prove that any particular concrete results were produced by the tour, but we can scarcely doubt that increased good will toward the United States resulted, even though there is no measure for such an intangible result. If there is any one thing conspicuously lacking in this world today it is international good will, and it would be difficult to place too high a value on any effort that added to the slender store. For a few hours at least nearly a million people in 17 countries in Europe, the Near East and north Africa received from the United States an artistic expression of the highest excellence. We were not trying to sell American music—the band played just the numbers that it might have played in a concert in your city or mine.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder

of the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, on page 33, line 5, after the parenthesis the capital A in the word "Any" should be spelled with a small a.

On page 46, line 1, the word "first" should be stricken and there be inserted in lieu thereof the word "fiscal." These are purely typographical errors and I ask unanimous consent that they may be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD: On page 47, line 16, after the word "possessions" strike out the remainder of the paragraph through the word "dislocations" in line 19.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am advised this language was placed in the act in conferences with the other body on 2 or 3 occasions, I am advised by the logistics people of the Department of Defense. The language on page 13 of the committee report explains the matter further, so I will not burden the committee with it.

This in effect hamstring and prevents the procurement and contract award people of the various branches of the armed services from coming to the assistance of distressed economic areas in this Nation. There have been many Members of the House who have spoken to me in connection with this language. I am more than delighted, since I represent one of the most distressed economic areas, with great unemployment, to offer an amendment to have this language removed from the bill, because it prevents great help being given to dozens of areas where men out of work need jobs.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The language that the gentleman from Pennsylvania proposes to strike out is as follows:

*Provided further, That no funds herein appropriated shall be used for the payment of a price differential on contracts hereafter made for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations.*

In other words, if you strike this language out price differentials can be made. Abuses will be encouraged, difficulties will be encountered. We have fought this battle out over the past 3 years. We had this language in the bill 2 or 3 years ago, we had it in a bill last year and we think it is most important that we keep it in the bill this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: Strike section 639, lines 4 to 11, inclusive.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the committee that I will not trespass very long on their time, but this is a very important amendment. Of course, had it not been for the rule which makes this bill in order, it would have been subject to a point of order because it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Now, let us see what it does. If you will examine the bill, it reads:

SEC. 639. No part of the funds appropriated in this act may be used for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise of work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense unless it has been justified before the appropriate committees of Congress that the disposal is economically sound and that the related services can be performed by a contractor without danger to national security.

Of course, the rule makes it in order, but I am asking the committee to strike it out, and these are the reasons why it should be stricken out. Of course, it is legislation. Now, there is pending before the Committee on Armed Services a bill, H. R. 5115, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Florida, which deals with this identical subject.

Now, what is the subject, and what is the purpose of it? The purpose of it is to keep the Government in business. Everybody understands that. And, I am weighing my words.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I want to compliment the gentleman for offering this amendment.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. TABER. I believe the interest of the Government would be better served by the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. I am in thorough accord with the gentleman. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. VINSON. When I find my good friend from New York [Mr. TABER], and my good friend from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], agreeing with me, I know I am on sound ground.

I am not going to trespass on your time. Now, we will give the author a hearing on his bill. He will have an opportunity to come before the committee, and it should be considered, because the Government is engaged in a great many things that the security of the Nation requires it to manufacture. But, on the other hand, this amendment would prohibit the Government from getting out of business until it comes back to a committee here. We do not know what committee, either the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, or the committee headed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON]. We do not know what committee it would have to get clearance through. So, the effect of the amendment is to keep the Government manufacturing things that the Government wants to get out of, and they cannot do it, if this section is agreed to, until some committee back here in the

Congress has had a review of it. The committee headed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], last year went into this subject matter. They had a long hearing, and they recommended that the Government adopt a policy to get out of business, and that policy went into effect in April of this year. Now, to adopt this section is absolutely in opposition to what the McCormack committee and the Hoffman committee and the others agreed on.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sorry my friend made reference to the Hoffman bill.

Mr. VINSON. I said his committee, not his bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. The bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], because the bill reported out of the committee did not do what the gentleman from Georgia says it did. There was an amendment adopted to the bill freezing it and applying it to the future.

Mr. VINSON. Let the House understand this. If you want the Government in business, you put section 639 in the bill. I do not want the Government in business. I want private enterprise in this country to operate; I want small business in this country. There are certain things it is necessary for the Department of Defense to do, and it is all right to do that, but there are hundreds of things that the Department of Defense is engaged in that private enterprise can do. Private enterprise has to support this country. You have to get taxes out of business to maintain the Department of Defense.

I am not going to take any longer, and everybody understands it. I hope you will vote for this amendment.

Section 639 prohibits the Department of Defense from using any funds appropriated under this act for the disposal or transfer, by contract or otherwise, of work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense unless it has been justified before the appropriate committees of Congress as economically sound and being without injury to the national security.

Were it in order for me to do so I would make a point of order objection to this section because it is clearly subject to one. But again I am precluded because of the nature of the rule under which we are now proceeding. Therefore, I shall base my objection on the merits of the case.

First, I would like to say that the inclusion of this section somewhat surprises me. I can find no testimony in the hearings of the Appropriations Committee to help us understand it and to justify its inclusion.

While I do not know who the sponsor might be, I would like to point out that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] introduced H. R. 5115 on March 21 and it was referred to the House Committee on Armed Services. I referred it to the Department of Defense on March 23, requesting a report and I would like to point out that the bill now pending

before the House Armed Services Committee is almost identical to the provisions of section 639.

If the author of the bill or any other Member would like for the Armed Services Committee to hold a hearing on the bill, the committee will be glad to do so.

Now what would this section accomplish if it were enacted? As I understand it, it would prevent the Department of Defense from transferring to private enterprise any work which was traditionally performed by civilian employees of the Department of Defense unless such transfer were first justified before the appropriate committees of Congress.

We find ourselves in a strange situation. It is the current policy of the Department of Defense, dated April 27, 1955, to use privately operated commercial and industrial type facilities to the greatest extent practicable.

Under that policy it is proposed that everything which can be done by private enterprise, without endangering the national defense, will be done. As I read this section it would require that the Congress would first have to give their permission to the Department of Defense before they could implement this policy.

I would like to point out that the criticism of the services staying in this kind of business was not raised by the House Armed Services Committee. It was raised by another committee of the House which conducted extensive hearings and made many far-reaching recommendations on this precise subject, which recommendations have been faithfully carried out by the Department of Defense.

So, in spite of the mandate of one standing legislative committee of the House that the Defense Department turn over to private industry their commercial and industrial type operations, to the greatest possible extent, we now find a section in this bill which would prevent the Defense Department from doing this without first getting the permission of some committee of Congress.

Most of this type of activity involves small business. Every day we try to help small business but in this procedure you simply place another stumbling block in their way.

The language in section 639 is so unclear that it would be almost impossible to interpret it. For instance, what is "traditional" work? Is it work performed for 5 years, 50 years, or 100 years? Or what other yardstick do you use to establish the meaning of "traditional" work? Frankly, I don't know and I don't see how anyone else could know under the language in this section.

The issue is clear cut. One committee of the Congress has insisted that the Defense Department get out of these commercial-type activities and turn them over to small business and other elements of private industry.

The Defense Department has agreed and adopted such a policy. In addition, there is a bill pending before the House Armed Services Committee on this very subject.

For these reasons I urge the Members to support my amendment in order that we may conduct our business in the Con-

gress in an orderly and intelligent manner.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Perfecting amendment offered by Mr. RIVERS to section 639: On page 50, line 8, after "justified", strike out the rest of line 8 and insert "and considered by both the Armed Services Committees of the House and the Senate and affirmative approval given by each 'committee'."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, here is what my amendment does. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] said he did not want the Government in business. My amendment makes our committee, the legislative committee, pass on those things about which he complains before the Department of Defense abolishes them.

I dislike intensely to disagree with my distinguished chairman, for whom I have the most everlasting esteem and of whom I have the most lofty opinion. But here is the kind of business they are in. For 100 years, they have been making rope in Boston. In no place on earth can they make rope the like of which they can make at the Boston Navy Yard.

Down here in Norfolk the navy yard discovered a paint that nobody in the history of that industry in this country discovered before. It abolishes and forever makes needless red lead when you paint a new ship. That is the kind of business your navy yard is in. They have got the know-how to repair clocks at the Boston Navy Yard such as is had no place else on earth.

At the Philadelphia Navy Yard, in the State of my distinguished friend [Mr. GAVIN], they have the know-how to make parachutes and things of that kind that nobody else can surpass.

That is not such a bad business for your Government to be in. These are your navy yards, 11 of them, created by acts of this Congress. I do not think it is entirely right to brand our navy yards as competitors all the way down the line with business.

Of course, everyone here knows my record. My record of conservatism surpasses the record of many others by so far that they could not be recognized as the same.

But I want to tell you this now. This amendment puts this control in our committee, where it belongs. It does not hurt the bill that has been referred to. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is to be commended. They will not veto this appropriation bill, but if we get one out of our committee, God knows where it will end up. Since we are going to legislate, since the Committee on Rules has given them authority to legislate in this bill, let us legislate right. Let us send this to our committee and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and I will take care of this country, as we have been doing.

Mr. VINSON. I do not want it. I do not want the Government in business.

Mr. RIVERS. Seldom have I disagreed with my chairman, but this is one time when my chairman just happens to be wrong. I will tell you something else. Take the matter of typewriter repairs.



We have got navy yards where they cannot get typewriter repairs, in some of these little, old towns. If we do not repair our own typewriters, who in the name of goodness is going to repair them? So this is not so bad.

I know they are quite intrigued about getting the Government out of business, but we do not want to destroy JOE MARTIN's Navy yard, we do not want to destroy JIM VAN ZANDT's navy yard, we do not want to destroy PORTER HARDY's navy yard. And we are not going to ask you to do it under the guise of getting the Government out of business when you and I know that that condition does not altogether exist.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] exercise his usual good judgment. I think his amendment, which is offered as a clarifying amendment, is a good one.

I had no thought that a simple effort to insure that Congress would be more fully informed on major changes in operating procedures in the Department of Defense—to insure that we in Congress would know something about what happens to the money that we appropriate would precipitate such excitement in some quarters, including my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I have high affection and esteem for this great and distinguished citizen. As a matter of fact I have followed his guidance pretty closely for nearly 15 years. I think this, however, is an appropriate time for him to follow mine.

We are discussing a very simple proposal. Here is the actual language of the bill:

Sec. 639. No part of the funds appropriated in this act may be used for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise of work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense unless it has been justified before the appropriate committees of Congress that the disposal is economically sound and that the related services can be performed by a contractor without danger to national security.

And here is the statement in the report which explains very clearly what is involved:

Section 639: Attention of the committee has on a number of occasions been directed toward plans within the Department of Defense for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise to contract operations of the work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense. The committee recognizes that there may be circumstances which make a contract operation more desirable than continuations of work by civilian personnel within the Department. In some instances, this, however, represents a radical departure from established customs and it is conceivable that contract operations could, if carried to extremes result in a loss of trained personnel and know-how within the departments with the dispersal of tools and facilities and result in an actually greater cost to the Government over a period of years. Particularly would this be true in the event of a sudden emergency which would require rapid expansion of "on-base" activities. The committee has no desire to hamper legitimate trans-

ferral of Government activities to private business where it can properly be shown that this is economically sound and that the related services can be performed by contract without danger to national security. In view, however, of the Government's great investment in its own shops and facilities and the know-how of its civilian personnel and because of this committee's responsibility in the matter of appropriations it is felt that a justification of transfers before the appropriate committees of Congress is proper before the transfers take place.

There is nothing here to keep Government in business; nothing to discriminate against private industry; nothing to prevent any legitimate transfer of an activity now performed by Government to private business. I have no desire to hinder such transfers. I simply want the Congress to know that they are proper transfers which will be performed without loss and with proper security to the Government. This language would require that at least one committee in the House and one in the Senate should be made acquainted with reasons and justification for changes in operating procedures of the type covered herein before they are made.

Now we know very well what all this opposition is about—and I am greatly surprised that my wise and astute friend from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] could be taken in by such maneuvering. Big business does not want any stumbling blocks placed in the way of the give-away programs. His business does not want any possible interference from Congress. They know nothing about this section. They never saw it. They have no idea what language it carries. But apparently they have been told by the Department of Defense that section 639 could upset the gravy train; might put a stop in the handing out of nice, fat, juicy plums. So they, or people in the Department, have been pulling strings all over the Nation. As a result a mounting flood of telegrams has been piling up, protesting this section.

Undoubtedly some of those people have been getting rich or anticipate getting rich through contracts with the Department of Defense.

To me it is rather significant that other wires have been coming to Washington on section 639 also. They are wires from plain people; wires from working people. They want the Government's interests and the taxpayers interests to be protected. I think their wishes are going to prevail here today.

No; I am not against private business. I am not against business taking over any function now performed by Government that business can do legitimately without jeopardizing national security and without costing more money. If however the primary objection to section 639 is based on the assumption that the transfer of Government activities to private business will automatically generate savings, I suggest that you let me quote from a directive which was issued by the Department of Defense—and I did not get this from official channels as you can well imagine. Here is what it states:

As a matter of general policy it is considered that only in exceptional cases should cost be considered a significant factor, and only in very unusual circumstances will sub-

stantial savings be the sole criteria for justification of continued operation of a facility.

If savings are not to be the criteria; just what is to govern considerations? In any case, should not the fact be known to Congress?

Let me go just a little further. We in the Congress have responsibility for the funds we appropriate for the Armed Services. We know of many instances where projects which have been justified before the committees and brought to the Congress in good faith by the committees are not carried out by the Department of Defense. The funds are diverted to other purposes, and the Congress is not consulted in any way. Is that a proper thing which helps prevent waste?

No, I am not trying to keep the Government in business. I just want Congress to know what is being done with the astronomical amounts of money we appropriate. I think we have a right to know, and that is all this language does. I am sick and tired of the secretariat of the Department of Defense and of other Departments of Government usurping the privileges of Congress, ignoring the Congress, and refusing to advise with the Congress when major changes are made in their spending programs.

This language is only a 1-year provision. The committee of the gentleman from Georgia will have ample time in that year to bring out corrective legislation to supplant section 639 if they desire to remedy the problem. Congress will be adjourning in a very few months. There is little likelihood, in view of our busy schedules henceforth that permanent corrective legislation will be enacted before we leave here. If section 639 is stricken from the bill, we may be in the position of locking the stable door after the horse has been stolen.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I am trying to get the situation straight in my own mind.

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Is the gentleman speaking for the language in the bill or for the language in the Rivers amendment?

Mr. SIKES. I do not object to the language in the Rivers amendment. It is a clarifying amendment.

Now, this in conclusion: What can possibly be wrong in having the military authorities justify to the appropriate committees of Congress the disposal by contract or otherwise to contract operations of the work traditionally or customarily done by civilian personnel?

I propose nothing that is obstructive, or time consuming, or that will hinder any proper transfer of activity. I do want Congress to be informed on the major changes in the military program, changes that affect not only spending, but changes that affect the lives and the families and the incomes of the people whom we represent.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the same course the gentleman from Missouri took, because actually, I think, the gentleman from Missouri was talking about another section of the bill, but I find it extremely difficult to disagree

with my beloved chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. However, he is off the beam on this thing, too. He gets that way every now and then. He will get back on the reservation if and when this bill is brought in to our committee.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I would be on the beam if I had a navy yard in my district, as the gentleman has.

Mr. HARDY. I might say to my friend from Georgia, shame. However, it goes further than that, as I shall show in this discussion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It applies to the Navy and it could apply to the acts passed by Congress. Somebody might be interested in it.

Mr. HARDY. Of course, we all have certain things we are interested in, and it just happens I do have a navy yard in my district, but I have more than a selfish interest in this section that the gentleman seeks to strike out. Under usual conditions I would prefer to see this proposition come before the Armed Services Committee in the bill introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]. Under other conditions I would prefer to see this matter handled in the regular routine manner in which it would be considered directly by the Armed Services Committee. Under the present practical situation it cannot be done that way and the reason it cannot be done that way is because of the proposals which are now under consideration by the Navy on which action is imminent.

I am in favor of getting the Government out of business wherever it can be done properly and economically with the best interests of the taxpayers in mind. I have supported a great many moves to get the Government out of business activities, and I think most of the Members of the House here know that during two Congresses I contributed about as much, I expect, as any other one individual toward economy in the Government, so I do not take any back seat to anybody on that.

Now, with respect to the specific matters that are currently under consideration, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] referred to a couple of them. One was the paint manufacturing plant in the navy yard at Norfolk. It manufactures paints that are not made in commercial manufacture. It is true that other paints were manufactured in that shop that were made competitively. Most, if not all, of that has now been discontinued; and, as my friend over here from Iowa just observed, the special paints that are made could be made on the outside.

There is a practical aspect to the matter. Do you think it would make for economy to turn over to commercial interests formulas developed by the Navy, formulas adapted only to Navy ships, formulas that require production in time with Navy needs and according to ex-

clusively Navy specifications. To turn that over to private industry just for the purpose of getting the Government out of business certainly would cost the taxpayer many times as much. I do not believe that is the kind of economy we want. Another consideration right now is that this paint is manufactured only at the navy yard at Norfolk, and the navy yard at Mare Island.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. Does the gentleman's amendment require that to be done, that the Navy discontinue manufacturing those paints?

Mr. HARDY. It is going to be done unless some plain language is put in.

Mr. DIES. I say, Does the gentleman's amendment require it?

Mr. HARDY. His amendment would strike out this language.

Mr. DIES. That is not an answer to the question. The gentleman said that they want the Government to stop the manufacturing of paint that no one else makes.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman's amendment would not in itself require it and neither will this language in itself keep it out. That is absolutely correct. But under the practices which are now taking place and the efforts which are now being made, the paint will not be made in the navy yard and the chronometer shops at Norfolk and San Diego are now in the process of being abolished when there is no place in the United States that can perform the service that is now being performed at the chronometer shops in the navy yards.

I favor getting the Government out of business where it is good sense to do so, but does anybody propose that we abolish the navy yards entirely. Do my colleagues recommend that we discontinue ship repair? Should we contract for the repair of all our aircraft? Some people seem to want to do this.

Recently following an unfortunate airplane accident near Norfolk the Navy sought an overhaul job from an aircraft manufacturer, who proposed the overhaul for a price of \$120,000. The local air station estimated that the job could be done in the local navy shops for \$60,000. After considerable delay the air station performed the job with civilian employees with a final cost of less than \$45,000. And this included considerable tooling expense.

So, I say Mr. Chairman, the Rivers amendment should be adopted and the Vinson amendment should be defeated so that the Congress can look at each of these proposals before serious damage is done. No one seriously contends that we should stop building ships entirely, and no one seriously contends that we should stop repairing ships and aircraft. If these functions are to be continued essential related functions must be continued.

Let us decide each of these actions on its merits, and let the Congress have a look at it before the action is taken.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is one of the most dangerous amendments for national defense I know of.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Which amendment is the gentleman talking about?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. I am trying to strike it out of the bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It should stay in the bill. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Rivers amendment.

Mr. Chairman, one thing has not been referred to, and that is the great danger, as I see it, to national defense. Where are you going to get your trained workers in the navy yard if they leave to go into other business because they have lost their highly trained work in the navy yards of the country and also the arsenals of the country? They have given their lives to that work. You cannot replace them. It will take years of training to replace them. You are endangering your national defense. Have you ever been in a ship immediately after a fire, as I did once, you would know the value of trained workers. This will not only affect the navy yards, it will affect the arsenals. We in Massachusetts see the workers of the navy yards and the arsenals without work. They are laying off workers and sending them to private industry.

Mr. RIVERS. My amendment does this: During this interim it gives our committee, the committee created by this House, an opportunity to consider legislation. It gives us jurisdiction over the matter, with the opportunity to report back to the House. During the interim we can report back to the House. During the interim we can report a bill out.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We had testimony from a group of people from New England the other day. Some of the work that has been taken from the Watertown Arsenal was performed by a private industry. There was a serious explosion and accidents. I do not want that to happen again.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I want to commend the gentleman for the fine statement she is making. May I emphasize the fact that the language of section 639 is not intended to keep the Government in business and would have no effect of preventing the Government from getting out of business. It simply would say that the Government would consult a committee of Congress before the step is taken so that the Congress would know what is being done and would know that the Government is getting fair financial treatment in the transaction.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Also it involves the proper making of the equipment and the things that are made to go to the Navy and the Army. In the navy yards and arsenals the work



is done for national defense by highly trained and skilled workers. It is very vital, as I see it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute or the clarifying amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] will not be agreed to. What I am driving at is the elimination of the entire section. The Armed Services Committee should not be required to trespass upon an executive function such as set out in this amendment.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman also propose to give up the passing on real estate projects by our Armed Services Committee, that has been so well and effectively performed by that committee?

Mr. VINSON. I am glad the gentleman raises that question. It is always the duty of the Government, when it buys anything, to say upon what terms and conditions it buys. It is always the duty of the Government to specify what terms it sells for. That is the difference between the two propositions.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Is this not just another attempt on the part of the Congress to really run the executive branch of the Government? Is this not just another effort to prevent the Department of Defense from handling its own executive business, not legislative business but executive business, as was intended to be prevented by the Constitution of the United States to be the case?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman from Louisiana is absolutely correct. Now you see who is concerned about this. You have heard this afternoon from the great Charleston Navy Yard.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. For your information, we do not manufacture anything but patriotism.

Mr. VINSON. All right. You should not manufacture anything, because you can go out and buy it cheaper.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], to strike section 639 from the Department of Defense appropriations bill for 1956.

Mr. Chairman, there are a great many of the Members of Congress who are genuinely disturbed by a growing tendency on the part of the Department of Defense to withdraw from Government installations work that has been traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense. I am convinced that it can develop into a dangerous policy inimical to the defense of our Nation. It represents, in some instances, a radical departure from estab-

lished custom. The policy is already resulting in a loss of trained personnel and know-how within agencies affected by the policy and experience clearly has demonstrated that it has, can and will result in greater costs to the Government.

Mr. Chairman, there are few who will quarrel with a legitimate transfer of Government activities to private business when it can be clearly shown that such action is economically sound and in the interest of the national defense. But, the present policy of the Defense Department and its rush to get the Government out of business, is being carried too far.

My area has had some experience with this matter. I am acutely aware of the effect of the Defense Department plans as they pertain to the Springfield Arsenal. I cannot understand why it persists in its policy. The M-1 Garand rifle was designed, and first produced at the Springfield Arsenal. Skilled workmen—some of the best in the Nation—have spent many years at this plant. It has taken considerable time and money to train this personnel. Under these circumstances, it is inconceivable that the Department would award contracts for the production of the M-1 to private business. But it has done it. And what is more disturbing and remarkable, it has awarded such contracts to firms that have never before manufactured or produced these weapons. It has done so despite the fact that the Springfield Arsenal can produce the rifle cheaper than private industry. The International Harvester Co., of Evansville, Ind., has been one of the beneficiaries of the Defense Department's largesse. It was put on the production line of M-1's only after extensive training by the Springfield Armory. Plans, specifications, equipment, machinery, and particular employees were detailed to assist the International Harvester Co. to get going. And even with this generous assistance, the Springfield Armory had to supply the receivers for the rifle. I am informed that the quality of the work was not as good and the cost per unit was higher.

I sincerely trust that the amendment to strike this section from the bill does not prevail. This section of the bill gives Congress an opportunity to have a look at the kind of policy the Department of Defense is pursuing. It is one way of telling the Department that the Congress will not countenance a pennywise, pound-foolish philosophy under the bugaboo of getting the Government out of business.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RIVERS) there were—yeas 120, nays 120.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair casts a vote in the affirmative.

So the perfecting amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. VINSON and Mr. MAHON.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 160, noes 134.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: In section 611, on page 37, at the end of line 9, strike the period and substitute a colon and add the following language: "Provided further, That, for the purposes of aiding in carrying out the national policy to insure that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for supplies and services for the Government be placed with small-business enterprises, and to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the Nation, the Department of Defense shall make a monthly report to the President, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives not less than 45 days after the close of the month, showing the amount of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense which have been expended, obligated, or contracted to be spent with small business as defined by the Small Business Administration, and the amount of such funds expended, obligated, or contracted to be spent with firms other than small business in the same fields of operation; and such monthly reports shall show separately the funds expended, obligated, or contracted to be spent for basic and applied scientific research and development."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It imposes new duties on the Department which are not presently authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment will do nothing more than require the Department of Defense to make monthly reports of its contracts awarded to business in accordance with the definition of small business prescribed by the SBA.

The purposes are, however, twofold: First, to force the Department of Defense to accept SBA's definition of small business. Second, to give SBA a club, which it will have by its power to prescribe the detail in which Defense must make reports to Congress, to yield up reports and operating information it needs in order to make (a) an intelligent appraisal of Defense's efforts to place a fair proportion with small business, and (b) to make intelligent recommendations to Defense on how to utilize small business in its procurement programs, and so forth.

The amendment is intended to mean that SBA can prescribe a definition of small business which uses a different standard or criteria for each industry or for each commodity group and to require defense to report the amount of contracts awarded to small business in each industry or commodity group, as well as

to report the amount of contracts awarded big business firms in these groups.

Procurement agencies of the Federal Government are required by three statutes to give a fair proportion of their purchases and contracts for supplies and services to small business. These are the Small Business Act of 1953 (Public Law 163, 83d Cong., 1st sess.), the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (Public Law 413, 80th Cong., 2d sess.) and the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong., 1st sess.). Nowhere in existing legislation is small business defined except as it is defined in the Small Business Act of 1953. Title II of this act establishes the Small Business Administration and defines its powers and responsibilities. Section 203 reads as follows:

For the purposes of this title, a small business concern shall be deemed to be one which is independently owned and operated and which is not dominant in its field of operation. In addition to the foregoing criteria the Administration, in making a detailed definition, may use these criteria, among others: Number of employees and dollar volume of business.

The phrase "Administration" refers to the Small Business Administration and this language in section 203 on the face of it requires the Small Business Administration to make the precise definition of small business within the general policy framework stated in this legislation. Moreover, if there is any question that this responsibility is not clearly that of the SBA, the report accompanying the bill H. R. 5141 makes it extremely clear.

Other sections of the Small Business Act also give SBA other powers and responsibilities concerning Department of Defense procurement and other activities. For example, section 212 states:

The Administration shall have the power, and it is hereby directed, whenever it determines such action is necessary—

(e) to obtain from any Federal department, establishment or agency engaged in procurement or in the financing of procurement or production such reports concerning the letting of contracts, and subcontracts and making of loans to business concerns as it may deem pertinent in carrying out its functions under this title.

Despite the fact that SBA clearly has the responsibility of making the precise definition of small business and of obtaining from any Federal department necessary reports concerning the letting of contracts, and so forth, in order to carry out its other responsibilities under the act, there is a grave question (a) whether the Department of Defense will in any practical way accept SBA's definition of small business, and (b) whether it will give SBA any reports on any subject matter other than in the form and manner in which Defense wants SBA to have reports.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. The amendment is a limitation on the language that is in the bill. It merely requires reporting to be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas imposes additional duties which are substantive in nature and, therefore, the proposed amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

#### PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do so for the purpose of asking the acting majority leader if he can tell us the legislative program for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. I will be very glad to do so. On Monday, we will consider the bill, H. R. 2126, the Saline Water Act of 1952.

On Tuesday, the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar will be called, and also the national reserve plan—the manpower bill, H. R. 5297.

As I understand, Tuesday is primary day in Pennsylvania so there will be no roll call on Tuesday. There may be some quorum calls, but any roll call will go over until Wednesday.

On Wednesday, we will consider the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1956.

Thursday, Friday, and Saturday are undetermined.

Mr. MARTIN. I think the gentleman is a little ambitious if he expects to get the Army reserve bill through in time to take up other business on Wednesday.

Mr. BOGGS. We will see what develops.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Page 30, immediately after line 20, insert:

"SEC. 602. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the pay and allowances of any commissioned officer, or the wages of any civilian employee, who is assigned to or employed in—

"(1) the office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, unless such officer or employee is subject to the authority of a general counsel of the Navy appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall be the chief legal officer of the Department of the Navy with responsibility for all legal functions within such Department under the general supervision of the general counsel of the Department of Defense;

"(2) the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Army, unless such officer or employee is subject to the authority of a general counsel of the Army appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall be the chief legal officer of the Department of the Army with responsibility for all legal functions within such Department under the general supervision of the general counsel of the Department of Defense; or

"(3) the office of the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force, unless such officer or employee is subject to the authority of a general counsel of the Air Force appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall be the chief legal officer of the Department of the Air Force with responsibility for all legal functions within such Department under the general supervision of the general counsel of the Department of Defense."

And renumber the succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that this is legislation on an appropriation bill and subject to a point of order and I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment today in the hope that it will be adopted for if it is, a tremendous amount of money will be saved by the American taxpayers and, at the same time, the legal services of our Armed Forces will be vastly improved.

The Hoover Commission recently reported on the legal services and procedure of the executive branch of the Government and, in its report, made a strong recommendation for the integration of the legal services of the Department of Defense, the Army, Navy, and Air Force through the General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

This proposition is not a new one, for the Rockefeller committee on the Department of Defense organization presented, on April 11, 1953, substantially the same recommendation. I have introduced legislation, H. R. 6115, to implement those recommendations, but I feel that the same end could be accomplished here today—in time to effect that tremendous saving in the next fiscal year. The distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia, has introduced the same legislation in his H. R. 6172.

In each of the armed services there is a monumental waste of money, talent, and efficiency because of the duplications in legal services. Each armed service has a two-headed monster of a legal department—composed in each instance of a Judge Advocate General and a General Counselor or Department Counselor. Division between the two heads is generally between civilian lawyers and military lawyers and between commercial law and military law. Overlapping of authority in the legal field exists throughout the whole Defense Establishment.

In addition to the dual authority which I have just mentioned there are many separate and independent offices and groups of lawyers, principally civilian, who are attached to the branches, services, corps, or commands and are not connected with, or responsible to, either a General Counsel or Judge Advocate General. The lack of coordination of legal services through a General Counsel of the Defense Department is a primary defect in the organization of the legal services of the Defense Organization.

"Effective coordination and direction of legal services in the Department of



Defense can only be achieved by establishing and recognizing an overall authority and responsibility centered in the General Counsel of that Department," the Hoover Commission report says. The report recognizes that lawyers in different locations should be responsible to their immediate superiors but emphasizes the need for a chain of authority and responsibility.

In addition, there should be established, in each of the armed services, a chief legal officer. This officer should be of Assistant Secretary rank and should be a trained professional lawyer, to be selected from civilian life by the President and appointed by him with the advice and consent of the Senate. It is elementary that professional services should be controlled by well equipped members of that profession.

We shall be discussing this important proposition at length in the future, for all of us here recognize our responsibility to ensure the efficient operation of a strong, well-integrated Defense Establishment. The American taxpayers are entitled to a reorganization which would operate their Defense Department in a more efficient, more economical manner. They are entitled, also, to legal organizations in the Army, Navy, and Air Force which are capable of performing legal services efficiently.

I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling], and the others who say it is foolish to cut our military manpower. If they are correct in the assertion that a balanced budget is the force behind the manpower cuts—then let us consider saving on useless legal duplication and use the money to keep our Armed Forces at the level recommended by their commanders.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHENCK: On page 49, line 22, strike out all of section 638.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, had the Committee on Rules in their rule not included the waiving of points of order I am sure this section would have been subject to a point of order. I take this time now, therefore, to ask that this section 638 be stricken from the bill and to inquire of the chairman of the committee if he wishes to state why this section was put in the bill.

Mr. MAHON. This particular section was placed in the bill to require the officials of the armed services when they come to Congress for money to state what they are going to do with the money. The section reads:

No part of any funds provided in this act shall be available or used for the moving of any major permanent facility until the use of such funds has been specifically justified before the appropriate committees of Congress.

The committee feels that the large sums that are required to move a major facility ought to be requested of Congress and that the Congress should be told that a certain number of thousands

of dollars, whatever may be required, will be used for the removal of certain facilities which are of a major nature.

I know the gentleman is from Dayton and that there is a proposal to move air research headquarters from Baltimore to Dayton. We are not objecting to the move of the facilities, but we are objecting to the fact that a forthright presentation was not made to Congress that part of the funds appropriated would be used for that purpose, and this is merely to compel the Pentagon officials to tell the Congress what will be done with the money that is requested of us from year to year. I think it is a fair request.

Mr. SCHENCK. May I say to the gentleman that certainly the heads of the various departments of defense know the needs of their departments and how they can best serve in the national interest. Certainly if we require each department of the defense organizations to appear before a congressional committee before it makes any move we surely do hamstring the Department of Defense and often interfere materially with this work which is vital to our national defense. So I hope the House will approve my amendment and strike this from the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the thought here is not that some separate appearance would be needed, but that when officials of the Department of Defense come to Congress for money each year, as they have done this year for \$31 billion-plus, that they shall tell the committee what they contemplate doing with the money. There is nothing unfair, improper, irregular, or unusual about that proposition.

It is true, as the gentleman from Ohio said, that the people who run these agencies are best informed perhaps as to whether or not they ought to be moved. This section would simply require that they justify such moves at the time they ask for the money which will be used in bringing about the move.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Do these representatives of the Department not come to your committee?

Mr. MAHON. They come before the committee, but there was no information whatever given with respect to some very significant moves they planned to make with funds appropriated by Congress. Congress did not know what the money was to be used for when it was appropriated.

Mr. SCHENCK. If the gentleman will yield further, these people certainly know what they ought to do and when they ought to do it.

Mr. MAHON. I think generally they do know what is best for them, and if they do and have a good reason they can tell the Congress what they want the money for when they request it.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. The requirement, as I understand, is that they should give the information to the committee at the time they ask for the money and not that they should report after the money is appropriated.

Mr. MAHON. Certainly, but they should not treat it so lightly, make a major expenditure without even a committee of Congress having been told about it, and without the funds having been requested specifically for the project.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I would like to read the section so the Committee can understand it. Of course, this also would have been subject to a point of order had not the rule waived it. Listen to this:

No part of any funds provided in this act shall be available or used for the moving of any major permanent facility until the use of such funds has been specifically justified before the appropriate committees of Congress.

I would like to ask the gentleman, What does he mean by "permanent facility"? Is it buildings or is it a function?

I call the Committee's attention to the fact that pending before the Armed Services Committee today is a proposition to move the facilities at Baltimore over to the Wright Patterson Airfield. This amendment deals with that and runs counter to any recommendation that might be made unless we say either the Appropriations Committee or the Armed Services Committee or Mr. Dawson's committee has passed on it.

Mr. MAHON. It seems to me that the Congress is mature enough and stable enough that it should be told by the Department of Defense, when the Department of Defense asks for money, what it is going to do with the money. If they are going to use it to move a major or permanent facility, and they are designated as either permanent or temporary, if they are going to move that function, they should tell us. It would not be the buildings, it would be that function. If they are going to move that function we should be told. We do not dispute the fact that some moves are desirable. I have an open mind on the proposed move stated here, but let us be given the facts. After all we are dealing with the taxpayers' money and we have a right to know the facts.

Mr. VINSON. How are you going to say what committee is going to deal with it? Is it the gentleman's committee? Is it the Armed Services Committee? Is it the Government Operations Committee?

Mr. MAHON. The amendment speaks for itself—"until the use of such funds has been specifically justified." All funds are justified before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. VINSON. Oh, no.

Mr. MAHON. When an appropriation is requested the funds are justified before the Appropriations Committee; if an authorization is requested, it is then before the gentleman's committee. But it would seem to me that the justifica-

tion should be before this committee. If the gentleman wants to burden his committee by including the Committee on the Armed Services of the House and Senate and the Appropriations Committee of the House and Senate I would have no objection.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman refers to the fact "before the committees" and not before the committee. Therefore, he had in mind not only the Appropriations Committee but other committees of the House.

Mr. Chairman, we are trespassing upon an area that is dangerous. Pending before the Armed Services Committee is a proposition to transfer something from Baltimore to over in Ohio and in hearings this has been agreed on. Suppose the committee comes in and says "We recommend it"? And the House comes along and says that it recommends it. Then you have a provision in this bill that none of this money can be used to make the transfer.

Mr. MAHON. None of it can be used until it has been justified. Is there any reason why those funds should not be justified before the people who have to stand on the floor and defend appropriation bills? I can see nothing wrong with our having that authority.

Mr. VINSON. It all gets down to the point of trying to legislate on appropriation bills.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Now, the language of the bill, if I understand it correctly, and if I understand the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], is aimed directly at the attempt to remove this facility from Baltimore—the people want it over there for commercial purposes—up to Dayton, Ohio. It was moved down there temporarily. Now, for a permanent installation they want it back with the other facility. Is that right?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. All that subject matter is pending before the Committee on Armed Services today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. And, when the gentleman says in opposition to the amendment that he wants some committee to justify it, I assume that the Committee on Appropriations got a justification before they put the money in there; at least, they must have heard something on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHENCK) there were—ayes 131, noes 125.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr.

KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Vinson amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 50, strike section 639, lines 4 through 11, inclusive.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RIVERS. Does the Vinson amendment strike out the entire section, which section was perfected by the amendment that I offered?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The answer to the gentleman's inquiry is in the affirmative.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask to have the amendment reread?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: Strike out all of section 639, on page 50, lines 4 through 11, inclusive.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 184, nays 202, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—184

Adair  
Alexander  
Alger  
Allen, Ill.  
Andersen,  
H. Carl  
Andersen,  
August H.  
Arendt  
Auchincloss  
Ayres  
Baker  
Barden  
Bass, N. H.  
Baumhart  
Becker  
Belcher  
Bennett, Mich.  
Bentley  
Berry  
Bettis  
Bolton,  
Frances, P.

Bonner  
Bosch  
Bow  
Brooks, La.  
Brooks, Tex.  
Brown, Ga.  
Brown, Ohio  
Brownson  
Budge  
Burlison  
Bush  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Cannon  
Carrigg  
Cederberg  
Chase  
Chenoweth  
Church  
Clevenger  
Cole  
Colmer  
Cooley  
Coon

Corbett  
Coudert  
Cramer  
Cretella  
Crumpacker  
Cunningham  
Curtis, Mo.  
Dague  
Davis, Wis.  
Dawson, Utah  
Derounian  
Devereux  
Dies  
Dixon  
Dolliver  
Dondero  
Dorn, S. C.  
Dowdy  
Durham  
Ellsworth  
Fenton  
Fisher  
Fjare

Fountain  
Frellinghuysen  
Fulton  
Gamble  
Gentry  
George  
Gross  
Gubser  
Gwinn  
Halleck  
Hand  
Harden  
Harrison, Nebr.  
Harvey  
Hébert  
Henderson  
Hess  
Hiestand  
Hill  
Hillings  
Hinshaw  
Hoeben  
Hoffman, Ill.  
Hoffman, Mich.  
Holt  
Hope  
Horan  
Hosmer  
Huddleston  
Ikard  
Jackson  
Jenkins  
Jensen  
Johansen  
Jonas  
Jones, N. C.  
Judd  
Kean  
Kearney  
Keating

Kilburn  
Kilday  
Kilgore  
Knox  
Krueger  
Laird  
Landrum  
Lanham  
Latham  
LeCompte  
Lipscomb  
Lovre  
McCulloch  
McDonough  
McGregor  
McIntire  
McVey  
Mason  
Meader  
Miller, Nebr.  
Miller, N. Y.  
Minshall  
Morano  
Murray, Tenn.  
Nicholson  
Osmer  
Ostertag  
Patterson  
Phillips  
Pillion  
Poage  
Poff  
Prouty  
Radwan  
Ray  
Reed, Ill.  
Rees, Kans.  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Robeson, Va.  
Sadlak

St. George  
Schenck  
Scherer  
Scudder  
Seely-Brown  
Selden  
Sheehan  
Shuford  
Siler  
Simpson, Ill.  
Simpson, Pa.  
Springer  
Taber  
Talle  
Thomas  
Thompson, La.  
Thompson, Mich.  
Thomson, Wyo.  
Thornberry  
Tollefson  
Utt  
Van Pelt  
Velde  
Vinson  
Vorsy  
Vursell  
Wainwright  
Watts  
Weaver  
Westland  
Wharton  
Williams, N. Y.  
Willis  
Wilson, Calif.  
Winstead  
Withrow  
Wolcott  
Younger

NAYS—202

Abbitt  
Abernethy  
Addonizio  
Allen, Calif.  
Andrews  
Ashley  
Ashmore  
Aspinall  
Bailey  
Baldwin  
Barrett  
Bass, Tenn.  
Bates  
Bell  
Bennett, Fla.  
Blatnik  
Blitch  
Boggs  
Boland  
Bolling  
Boykin  
Boyle  
Bray  
Broyhill  
Buehanan  
Burdick  
Burnside  
Byrd  
Byrne, Pa.  
Carlyle  
Carnahan  
Celler  
Chelf  
Chipperfield  
Christopher  
Chudoff  
Clark  
Cooper  
Curtis, Mass.  
Davidson  
Davis, Tenn.  
Dawson, Ill.  
Deane  
Delaney  
Denton  
Diggs  
Dingell  
Dollinger  
Donohue  
Donovan  
Dorn, N. Y.  
Doyle  
Edmondson  
Elliot  
Engle  
Evins  
Fallon  
Fascell  
Feighan  
Fernandez  
Flood  
Flynt  
Fogarty  
Forand

Ford  
Forrester  
Frazier  
Friedel  
Garmatz  
Gary  
Gathings  
Gavin  
Grant  
Gray  
Green, Oreg.  
Gregory  
Griffiths  
Hagen  
Hale  
Haley  
Hardy  
Harris  
Harrison, Va.  
Hays, Ark.  
Hays, Ohio  
Hayworth  
Herlong  
Holifield  
Holmes  
Hull  
Hyde  
Jarman  
Jennings  
Johnson, Calif.  
Johnson, Wis.  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, Mo.  
Karsten  
Kee  
Kelley, Pa.  
Kelly, N. Y.  
King, Calif.  
Kirwan  
Klein  
Kluczynski  
Knutson  
Lane  
Lankford  
Lesinski  
Long  
McCarthy  
McCormack  
McMillan  
Macdonald  
Machrowicz  
Mack, Ill.  
Mack, Wash.  
Madden  
Magnuson  
Mahon  
Mailhard  
Marshall  
Martin  
Matthews  
Morrow  
Metcalf  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Md.

Mills  
Mollohan  
Morgan  
Moss  
Moulder  
Murray, Ill.  
Natcher  
Norrell  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Hara, Minn.  
O'Neill  
Passman  
Patman  
Pelly  
Perkins  
Pfost  
Philbin  
Polk  
Powell  
Price  
Priest  
Quigley  
Rabaut  
Rains  
Reuss  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Richards  
Riley  
Rivers  
Robison, Ky.  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rogers, Mass.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Rooney  
Roosevelt  
Rutherford  
Saylor  
Schwengel  
Scott  
Scrivner  
Shelley  
Sheppard  
Sieminski  
Sikes  
Sisk  
Smith, Kans.  
Smith, Va.  
Spence  
Staggers  
Steed  
Sullivan  
Teague, Calif.  
Teague, Tex.  
Thompson, N. J.  
Thompson, Tex.  
Trimble  
Tuck  
Udall  
Vanik  
Van Zandt  
Walter



Whitten Williams, N. J. Yates  
Wier Wilson, Ind. Zablocki  
Wigglesworth Wolverton  
Williams, Miss. Wright

## NOT VOTING—48

Albert Granahan Pilcher  
Anfuso Green, Pa. Preston  
Avery Heselton Reece, Tenn.  
Beamer Holtzman Reed, N. Y.  
Bolton James Riehlman  
Oliver, P. Kearns  
Bowler Keogh  
Buckley King, Pa. Short  
Canfield McConnell Smith, Miss.  
Chatham McDowell Smith, Wis.  
Davis, Ga. Morrison Taylor  
Dempsey Multer Wickersham  
Dodd Mumma Widnall  
Eberharter Nelson Young  
Fine Norblad Zelenko  
Fino O'Brien, N. Y.  
Gordon O'Konski

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Buckley against.  
Mr. Beamer for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. Albert against.  
Mr. Widnall for, with Mr. Anfuso against.  
Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Keogh against.  
Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Gordon against.

Mr. Preston for, with Mr. Fine against.  
Mr. Pilcher for, with Mr. Dempsey against.  
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Multer against.  
Mr. Avery for, with Mr. Roberts against.  
Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Holtzman against.

Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. Tumulty against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Heselton.  
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Canfield.  
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Fino.  
Mr. Dodd with Mr. James.  
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. McConnell.  
Mr. Bowler with Mr. Mumma.  
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Norblad.  
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Riehlman.  
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.  
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Nelson.  
Mr. Smith of Mississippi with Mr. Young.

Mr. BELL and Mr. CHRISTOPHER changed their votes from yea to nay.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 384, nays 0, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

YEAS—384

Abbt	Arends	Bates
Abernethy	Ashley	Baumhart
Adair	Ashmore	Becker
Addonizio	Aspinall	Belcher
Alexander	Auchincloss	Beil
Alger	Ayres	Bennett, Fla.
Allen, Calif.	Bayley	Bennett, Mich.
Allen, Ill.	Baker	Bentley
Andersen,	Baldwin	Berry
H. Carl	Barden	Betts
Andresen,	Barrett	Blatnik
August H.	Bass, N. H.	Blitch
Andrews	Bass, Tenn.	Boggs

Boland	Gavin	Martin
Bolling	Gentry	Matthews
Bolton,	George	Meader
Francis P.	Grant	Merrow
Bonner	Gray	Metcalf
Bosch	Green, Oreg.	Miller, Calif.
Bow	Gregory	Miller, Md.
Boykin	Griffiths	Miller, Nebr.
Boyle	Gross	Miller, N. Y.
Bray	Gubser	Mills
Brooks, La.	Gwinn	Minshall
Brooks, Tex.	Hagen	Mollohan
Brown, Ga.	Hale	Morano
Brown, Ohio	Haley	Morgan
Brownson	Halleck	Moss
Broyhill	Hand	Moulder
Buchanan	Harden	Murray, Ill.
Budge	Hardy	Murray, Tenn.
Burdick	Harris	Natcher
Burleson	Harrison, Nebr.	Nicholson
Burnside	Harrison, Va.	Norrell
Bush	Harvey	O'Brien, Ill.
Byrd	Hays, Ark.	O'Hara, Ill.
Byrne, Pa.	Hays, Ohio	O'Hara, Minn.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hayworth	O'Neill
Cannon	Hébert	Osmers
Carlyle	Henderson	Ostertag
Carnahan	Herlong	Passman
Carrigg	Hess	Patman
Cederberg	Hiestand	Patterson
Celler	Hill	Pelly
Chase	Hillings	Perkins
Chelf	Hinshaw	Pfost
Chenoweth	Hoeven	Philbin
Chipperfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Phillips
Christopher	Hoffman, Mich.	Pillion
Chudoff	Hollifield	Poage
Church	Holmes	Poff
Clark	Holt	Polk
Clevenger	Hope	Powell
Colmer	Horan	Price
Cooley	Hosmer	Priest
Coon	Huddleston	Prouty
Cooper	Hull	Quigley
Corbett	Hyde	Rabaut
Coudert	Ikard	Radwan
Cramer	Jackson	Rains
Cretella	Jarman	Ray
Crumpacker	Jenkins	Reed, Ill.
Cunningham	Jennings	Rees, Kans.
Curtis, Mass.	Jensen	Reuss
Curtis, Mo.	Johansen	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dague	Johnson, Calif.	Rhodes, Pa.
Davidson	Johnson, Wis.	Richards
Davis, Tenn.	Jonas	Riley
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Rivers
Dawson, Ill.	Jones, Mo.	Robeson, Va.
Dawson, Utah	Jones, N. C.	Robison, Ky.
Deane	Judd	Rodino
Delaney	Karsten	Rogers, Colo.
Denton	Kearney	Rogers, Fla.
Derounian	Keating	Rogers, Mass.
Devereux	Kee	Rogers, Tex.
Dies	Kelley, Pa.	Rooney
Diggs	Kelly, N. Y.	Roosevelt
Dingell	Kilburn	Rutherford
Dixon	Kilday	Sadlak
Dollinger	Kilgore	St. George
Dolliver	Kirwan	Saylor
Dondero	Klein	Schenck
Donohue	Kluczynski	Scherer
Donovan	Knox	Schwengel
Dorn, N. Y.	Knutson	Scott
Dorn, S. C.	Krueger	Scribner
Dowdy	Laird	Sculder
Doyle	Landrum	Seely-Brown
Durham	Lane	Selden
Edmondson	Lanham	Sheehan
Elliot	Lankford	Sheeley
Ellsworth	Latham	Sheppard
Engle	LeCompte	Shuford
Evins	Lesinski	Sieminski
Fallon	Lipscomb	Sikes
Fascell	Long	Siler
Feighan	Lovre	Simpson, Ill.
Fenton	McCarthy	Simpson, Pa.
Fernandez	McCormack	Slak
Fisher	McCulloch	Smith, Kans.
Fjare	McDonough	Smith, Va.
Flood	McGregor	Spence
Flynt	McIntire	Springer
Garty	McMillan	Staggers
Forand	McVey	Steed
Ford	Maddison	Sullivan
Forrester	Machrowicz	Taber
Fountain	Mack, Ill.	Talle
Frazier	Mack, Wash.	Teague, Calif.
Frelinghuysen	Madden	Teague, Tex.
Friedel	Magnuson	Thomas
Fulton	Mahon	Thompson, La.
Gamble	Mailliard	Thompson,
Garmatz	Marshall	Mich.
Gary		Thompson, N. J.
Gathings		Thompson, Tex.

Thomson, Wyo. Vursell  
Thornberry Wainwright  
Tollefson Walter  
Trimble Watts  
Tuck Weaver  
Udall Westland  
Utt Wharton  
Vanik Whitten  
Van Pelt Wier  
Van Zandt Wigglesworth  
Velde Williams, Miss.  
Vinson Williams, N. J.  
Vorys Williams, N. Y.

## NOT VOTING—50

Albert	Gordon	O'Brien, N. Y.
Anfuso	Granahan	O'Konski
Avery	Green, Pa.	Pilcher
Beamer	Heselton	Preston
Bolton,	Holtzman	Reece, Tenn.
Oliver P.	James	Reed, N. Y.
Bowler	Kearns	Riehlman
Buckley	Keogh	Roberts
Canfield	King, Pa.	Short
Chatham	McConnell	Smith, Miss.
Cole	McDowell	Smith, Wis.
Davis, Ga.	Mason	Taylor
Dempsey	Morrison	Tumulty
Dodd	Multer	Wickersham
Eberharter	Mumma	Widnall
Fine	Nelson	Young
Fino	Norblad	Zelenko

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Short.  
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Taylor.  
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Widnall.  
Mr. Albert with Mr. Cole.  
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Fino.  
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Heselton.  
Mr. Multer with Mr. Canfield.  
Mr. Fine with Mr. Avery.  
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Beamer.  
Mr. Green with Mr. Kearns.  
Mr. Gordon with Mr. James.  
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Young.  
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Reed of New York.  
Mr. Roberts with Mr. O'Konski.  
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Nelson.  
Mr. Dodd with Mr. Mason.  
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.  
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. Preston with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.  
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Tumulty with Mr. McConnell.  
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Mumma.  
Mr. Bowler with Mr. Riehlman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers in the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON THE BILL

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the bill today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include appropriate excerpts, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to have my remarks appear at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on this bill just passed I voted "yea," but I hope in the future when bills for the Defense Department are presented on the floor of the House for approval that they will contain a provision whereby the money will be spent on competitive bids, particularly more so than it is now.

I noted that 85 percent of the money spent for the defense of this Nation is spent on a negotiated basis. I certainly hope that legislation or Executive orders will be issued whereby competitive bids will be taken on procurement contracts for the Defense Department in the future.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION—A LONG WAY TO GO

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned that over-optimistic reports of alleged improvements in the labor market appearing in the newspapers of the Nation may lull us all into a false sense of satisfaction with the present employment situation. For instance, several days ago—on May 7, to be exact—the Washington Evening Star, on its first page quoted Republican statements to the effect that the new gains in employment "if the trend continues, promises to undermine a potential Democratic issue in the 1956 Democratic campaign."

Let me state here categorically that my concern about such statements has no political overtones. The question of how many Americans looking for work are unable to find it, is to all of us, I am sure, far too serious a matter to be exploited for political advantage.

There have been, of course, numerous recent occasions when we have had good reason to believe that the press of the Nation has dealt politically rather than factually with important national issues.

In this instance, however, the newspapers are not to blame for any misleading statements on the current employment situation that they may print. In good faith, these statements are based

upon official releases issued jointly by Secretary Sinclair Weeks of the United States Department of Commerce and Secretary James P. Mitchell of the United States Department of Labor.

These releases, or handouts, present to the press the administration's official interpretation of monthly statistical reports on the labor force prepared by conscientious members of the staffs of both Departments. Certainly under these circumstances the press has no reason to question the authenticity of the statements made.

However, as we in Congress have good reason to know, statistical data is susceptible of many and varied interpretations. This is nowhere more true than in its application to the complex and involved subject of employment and unemployment data.

What are the true facts about employment and the job situation at the present time? They are nowhere nearly so reassuring as the latest statements of Secretary of Labor Mitchell and Secretary Weeks would like to have us believe. Those who will take time to study the fine print in the monthly report on the labor force for April 1955, released on May 6, will find that the accurately reported statistical data does not support the glowing optimism of the administration's spokesmen.

What stands out clearest in the fine print is the sobering fact that although, according to the Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production, our national product is now at about the same high level as that achieved in the peak months of 1953, we are accomplishing this production today with 1.2 million fewer workers in our factories and mines than were employed 2 years ago.

Further careful examination of the material presented in detail in the full monthly report on the labor force reveals that in spite of the exuberance displayed in this combined employment and unemployment release, unemployment did not really go down between March and April, 1955, when seasonal corrections are taken into account. Indeed, as the fine print in the full report flatly states the decrease was less than should normally occur. In the seasonally adjusted index appearing at the bottom of table 1 of the current report, unemployment actually rose 6 percent between March and April. As a matter of fact, the number of nonagricultural employees, including the armed services, in March 1955 was still 1.8 million under March 1953.

Today, the officially reported numbers of the unemployed would be far more serious if normal growth of the labor force had taken place during the past 2 years. However, the administration job market has slowed the growth of our work force down to less than half of normal, as many potential workers have left the labor market unable to find jobs for which they are equipped through experience and training. I am particularly worried about the older worker; the experienced skilled worker; the specialist, who with heavy family obligations, can-

not move to a new industrial location without help or develop a new skill without additional training. These men—our skilled labor force—are part of our Nation's backbone and have always been a major element in our industrial strength.

Even though we may choose to look at the national employment situation through rosy-hued spectacles, there are many areas in which the situation is still a deep indigo. I represent such an area in West Virginia, and it is not just the coal industry that has created our difficulties. In my home county of Marion, 13½ percent of the working population is jobless and 25 percent of the population is dependent upon some form of public assistance—the distribution of surplus foods, for example—to stay alive.

Two-thirds of the largest labor markets in the Nation now provide fewer jobs than 2 years ago. In many of these areas, including some of the largest urban centers in the United States, there are 5, 10, or even 15 percent fewer jobs than 2 years ago—shortly after the Republicans took over. In a number of areas, one-tenth of the job seekers are officially admitted to be unemployed. In others, the figures are substantially higher.

I am deeply concerned about this failure to provide employment for Americans anxious to work—and who certainly cannot share in our way of life unless they find it. I am worried about our increasing ability to meet our production needs with fewer workers if this real trend continues. I am worried about an administration that sugarcoats and distorts the facts and what they mean to us as a Nation at home and abroad.

No amount of expert public relations will provide jobs for our people; or reassure, for long, a man worried about his family's support; or protect his savings against adversity when he is out of work; or raise his standard of living or even improve his outlook, on the basis of some quoted national average. We cannot count on wartime backlogs, Marshall plans, Government life insurance dividend payments, and larger defense programs or increasing Armed Forces indefinitely. The latter have both already been heavily reduced.

Mr. Speaker, I am measuring my words. We cannot have a better America unless we are mature enough, patriotic enough, courageous enough, and intelligent enough to face the facts which today are being either obscured or even suppressed.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MACHROWICZ and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALEY and to include a magazine article.

Mr. SHEEHAN.

Mr. KEAN and to include a letter.



Mr. QUIGLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KNUTSON.

Mr. PRIEST and to include a letter and statement.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GWINN referring to the Reed-Dirksen amendment.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. MOLLOHAN) and include a statement by Honorable Carlos T. Romulo, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$280.

Mr. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin).

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WESTLAND (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin).

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. KLEIN).

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCHERER, from May 16 through May 20, on account of hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. GORDON (at the request of Mr. PRICE), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. DOYLE, for 4 days, beginning May 16, 1955, on account of official business as a member of the subcommittee of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1831. An act to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1602. An act to enable the State of Arizona and the town of Tempe, Ariz., to convey to the Salt River Agricultural Improvement and Power District, for use by such district, a portion of certain property heretofore transferred under certain restrictions to such State and town by the United States.

H. R. 1816. An act to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort

Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters;

H. R. 2225. An act to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 2679. An act to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.; and

H. R. 4936. An act to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating plant operations.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, May 16, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

791. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the appointment of an assistant chaplain at the United States Military Academy and to fix the compensation of the chaplain and assistant chaplain thereof"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

792. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend subsection 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 relating to transportation and storage of household goods of military personnel on permanent change of station"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

793. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Capt. William S. Ahalt, and others"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

794. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the following claims: *Morongo Band of Mission Indians of California, Plaintiff, v. The United States of America, Defendant* (Docket No. 325), and *The Osage Nation of Indians, Petitioner, v. The United States of America, Defendant* (Docket No. 9), pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U. S. C. 70); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 727. An act to adjust the salaries of the judges of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia Tax Court; with amendment (Rept. No. 586). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5652. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army and Air Force,

and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 587). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6063. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, to exempt certain officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives from the requirements of such act relating to the registration of motor vehicles and the licensing of operators when they can prove legal residence in some State; without amendment (Rept. No. 588). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 6196. A bill to provide that the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board establish and maintain Government liquor stores in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. R. 6197. A bill to incorporate the United Mexican Border Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 6198. A bill to provide for the sale of certain war housing projects to the Housing Authority of Beaver County, Pa., for use in providing rental housing for persons of limited income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 6199. A bill to amend the act of October 14, 1940, to authorize the sale of personal property held in connection with housing under such act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6200. A bill to recognize and facilitate the administration of the multiple uses of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 6201. A bill to amend section 406 of the Federal Seed Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 6202. A bill to provide that certain findings of disability made for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, shall be binding upon the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 6203. A bill to amend section 406 of the Federal Seed Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6204. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate Patriot's Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 6205. A bill to authorize Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of privately owned real property as well as the shores of publicly owned real property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 6206. A bill to provide for the establishment of a purchase program for domestic manganese ore for the southern Appalachian area; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 6207. A bill to amend subsections (a) and (b) of section 351 of the Public Health

Service Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 6208. A bill to amend paragraph (1) of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 6209. A bill to provide for the relief of certain reclamation homestead entrymen; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 6210. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6211. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 6212. A bill to amend section 214 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to expenses for care of certain dependents) with respect to taxpayers whose wives are physically or mentally incapable of caring for themselves; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRD (by request):

H. R. 6213. A bill to provide pensions for the dependent parents of certain World War I veterans who die from non-service-connected causes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 6214. A bill to sell certain agricultural lands of the United States in Oregon under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOWDY (by request):

H. R. 6215. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide the maximum retired pay for certain retired enlisted men for the period from June 1, 1942, through June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 6216. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to assist States in the carrying out of plans for forest land tree planting and reforestation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 6217. A bill to aid in promoting employment opportunities for members of minority groups; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 6218. A bill to authorize payment by the Federal Government of the cost of making certain studies necessary to assist the Menominee Tribe of Indians to prepare for the termination of Federal supervision; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 6219. A bill to amend section 406 of the Federal Seed Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 6220. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 6221. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act so as to permit the making of payments to farmers for certain water-conservation practices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 6222. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to assist States in the carrying out of plans for forest land tree

planting and reforestation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 6223. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 6224. A bill to repeal those provisions of law which exclude from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system service performed by an individual in the employ of his son, daughter, or spouse, and service performed by a child in the employ of his father or mother; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6225. A bill to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran for furnishing him a copy of his discharge or a copy of his certificate of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6226. A bill to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 in respect of distributions in kind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 6227. A bill to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 6228. A bill to permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans and 9-month construction loans; to amend sections 5136 and 5221 of the Revised Statutes; to amend the Federal Reserve Act; and to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 6229. A bill to permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans and 9-month construction loans; to amend sections 5136 and 5221 of the Revised Statutes; to amend the Federal Reserve Act; and to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 6230. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, 74th Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar, Leyte, and Luzon, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. Con. Res. 124. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. Res. 243. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to investigate and study the factors involved in the separation or proposed separation of Cpl. Walter William Kulich from the United States Army Reserve; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact emergency legislation readjusting the import duty on vegetables

brought into this country from foreign nations sufficient in amount to equalize the difference in cost of production between foreign and domestic-grown crops and to prevent the flooding of our domestic markets by the importation of these foreign agricultural products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the Delegate from Hawaii to seek Federal aid in investigating the commercial uses for methods of destruction of lava beds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to increase the immigration quotas applicable to the peoples of the Pacific and Asiatic areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 6231. A bill for the relief of the estate of Judge John J. Speight, deceased, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6232. A bill to include as Spanish-American War service under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration certain service rendered by Stephen Swan Ogle-tree during the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 6233. A bill for the relief of Francisco Alvarez Suarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 6234. A bill for the relief of Paul Jordan (or Fryderyk Jakub Einaugler); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 6235. A bill for the relief of Emma Basil Osorowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 6236. A bill for the relief of Abraham, Fanny Gorda, Claire Sarah and Alain Leo Trigouboff (also known as Traig); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 6237. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Fuller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 6238. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Auguste French; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

261. By Mr. GATHINGS: Petition of several members of the First Baptist Church of West Memphis, Ark., favoring H. R. 4627 and S. 923; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

262. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the post commander, Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., Post 1755, The American Legion, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging enactment of H. R. 595, H. R. 3088, H. R. 3318, and S. 967, providing for the maintenance of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.



## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

**Florence Nightingale, National Hospital Week, and Speech by Miss Margaret G. Arnstein, of the United States Public Health Service**

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today is the 135th anniversary of the birth of Florence Nightingale, the founder of nursing methods as we know them today. During the Crimean War Miss Nightingale raised a band of nurses and took them to the Turkish military hospital at Scutari, on the Bosphorus. On November 4, 1854, she assumed control of the hospital and introduced system and order where indescribable chaos had reigned—and thereby laid the foundations of modern scientific nursing.

But Florence Nightingale is known for more than her heroic deeds in the Crimea. As Miss Margaret G. Arnstein, of the United States Public Health Service, says in the appended speech:

All nursing has been influenced by her. One might say modern nursing is Miss Nightingale.

To Florence Nightingale we owe both the high professional standards and the system of professional education which has given us 390,000 active professional nurses in America today. Other American nurses are giving their services throughout the world. Among them are such women as Mary Mills, of the United States Public Health Service, Chief Nurse, on a technical-assistance mission to Lebanon for the Foreign Operations Administration. I understand that Miss Mills has just been awarded the Lebanese Order of Merit by the Minister of Public Health for establishing the new Makafid School of Nursing in that Near Eastern nation. Miss Mills was previously decorated by the Liberian Government for a comparable feat.

## NATIONAL HOSPITAL WEEK

This week we are observing another major influence on the good health of Americans through National Hospital Week. Just recently I delivered an address at the oldest hospital in the United States, the 200-year-old Pennsylvania Hospital in Philadelphia. The tradition of that fine institution reminded me of how far we have come since the days when hospitals were considered places to die.

Today hospitals are the centers of our community's health services, and our national and State hospital associations are working hard to provide the highest quality care for all Americans.

In the past several years there has been a great increase in hospital con-

struction. This is due both to the stimulus offered by the Hill-Burton Act, and to the determination of the States and communities that their citizens should receive the full benefit of new advances in the medical sciences.

It has been estimated that the number of persons in the United States without access to acceptable general hospital services has been reduced from 10 million in 1947 to less than 4 million last year. New hospitals in rural areas are attracting physicians and other health personnel. Most new hospitals are using sound architectural practices. They are making provisions for consultation services in such fields as pathology, roentgenology, and other diagnostic services. All of these factors contribute to better care of the American people.

There is still ever so much to be done, with facilities for the chronically ill and for mental patients still in very scarce supply. But we are making progress, and that is what is important.

During National Hospital Week and the anniversary of Florence Nightingale, we should all offer our sincerest thanks to the men and women in the health professions who have dedicated their lives to fighting disease, to relieving human suffering, and to preventing needless death.

## ARNSTEIN SPEECH

Under leave granted me by unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a speech by one of the leaders of the nursing profession, Miss Margaret G. Arnstein, Chief of the Division of Nursing Resources of the United States Public Health Service. Her address was made before the section on historical and cultural medicine of the New York Academy of Medicine in New York City, May 11, 1955:

## THE INFLUENCE OF FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE ON NURSING

Modern nursing derives so completely from the example and teaching of Florence Nightingale that it is hard to pick out the particular practices that owe their existence to her influence. All nursing has been influenced by her. One might say modern nursing is Miss Nightingale—that her name is a synonym for nursing. She demonstrated in a dramatic fashion in the Crimea that nursing—and sanitation—could reduce mortality, as Dr. Berry will describe to you.

The medical profession has long recognized the essential role of nursing in care of patients and prevention of illness. The Academy of Medicine tonight in paying tribute to Florence Nightingale, is paying tribute to the contribution nursing makes to medical practice.

Nursing literally did not exist, except in a few religious orders, until Miss Nightingale showed what it could do, and more important, established a school to produce people who could do it. This first school at St. Thomas' Hospital in London was a model for all the later schools in England and the United States. Nightingale nurses became heads of all the early schools established in England. Bellevue Hospital School of Nursing in New York, the first in this country to introduce the Nightingale principles, was ac-

tually guided by letters from Miss Nightingale.

This evening I would like to detach Miss Nightingale's principles from their historical setting and discuss them in relation to modern nursing. To do this one must recognize that Miss Nightingale had both a good influence and a bad influence on nursing. Most of the bad influence is due to the fact that we have slavishly followed some practices she strongly advocated, long after the need for them has disappeared. Some of it is due to the fact that we have continued with practices she initiated, but have ignored the underlying principles which she set forth.

The influences that have outlived their social usefulness are almost entirely related to the conduct of student nurses. When Miss Nightingale started the first training school, the Nightingale nurse, in the words of one of her biographers, "had to establish her character in a profession proverbial for its immorality."

The probationers, as students were called, had their entire lives controlled by the school as though in a convent. They had 2 hours of outdoor exercise each day, outside the dormitory. They were never allowed to leave the dormitory alone. All other time was scheduled: meals, work and learning, and sleep. All this control probably was necessary at that time. The fact that some of it has lingered on into the middle of the 20th century shows we did not consider the reason for the practice but clung to the practice itself long after the respectability of nursing was established, and young women in our society had attained much more independence.

Miss Nightingale herself recognized the danger of stereotyping. In the paper, *Sick Nursing and Health Nursing*, that she read in Chicago in 1893, when she was in her seventies, she said, "No system can endure that does not march."

On the other hand, if we had followed as closely all else that she taught, we would not now be trying to undo so much of what we recently have been teaching and doing in this country in nursing.

This astonishing person had such vision and understanding that I sometimes think a school of nursing today could not do better than read from her writings each morning a lesson for the day. The lesson could then be expanded with the knowledge of human relations and with the scientific facts we have acquired since her day, but I doubt that many new lessons would be needed.

It is a little disconcerting to realize some of our most modern ideas—that are still opposed by some nurses and some of the related professions—that these dangerous new ideas were taught by Miss Nightingale 95 years ago. Our leaders in nursing today have come to these ideas quite independently and have contributed greatly to getting us back on the track and several miles ahead of the point where we went off.

We might consider these ideas under three main headings: care of the patient in the hospital and in the home; administration of nursing services; and education of nurses.

About care of the patient, the most advanced members of the nursing profession are stressing the idea that we must nurse the whole patient and not just his disease. Miss Nightingale expressed the same principle. She said, "The art is that of nursing the sick." And she added, "Please mark—nursing the sick; not nursing sickness."

Her definition of nursing the sick included giving the medicines and stimulants prescribed, and the surgical appliances, proper use of fresh air, warmth, and cleanliness,

proper choosing and giving the diet, and quiet. All this was to be done, she wrote, "at least expense of vital power of the sick."

Psychosomatic medicine is a relatively new concept, yet the great physicians and nurses of the past recognized the influence of emotions on disease conditions. In writing about the care of patients, Miss Nightingale gave attention to the ways a patient's illness is affected by his state of mind, his worries and fears, the attractiveness or drabness of his surroundings, and the noise around him. She summed it up as follows:

"The symptoms or the sufferings generally considered to be inevitable and incident to the disease are very often not symptoms of the disease at all, but of something quite different—of the want of fresh air \* \* \* or of quiet or of cleanliness or of punctuality. \* \* \* The reparative process \* \* \* has been hindered \* \* \* by some want in one or in all of these things."

We can almost hear the modern cardiologist saying, as she did, "Apprehension, uncertainty, waiting, expectation, fear of surprise, do a patient more harm than any exertion."

Psychiatrists today teach us that the type of reassurance which tells a patient not to worry, the operation will not amount to anything, he will be all right, and other such encouragements, often defeats its own end. Today we believe that listening to the patient, the process we call nondirective interviewing, is actually more helpful. Although we did not learn this principle from Florence Nightingale, we might have done so. Although no one had ever heard of "nondirective interviewing," Miss Nightingale admonished, "Do not cheer the sick by making light of their danger," and continued at length to discuss the understanding of patients' fears and their individual differences.

In recent years we have recognized that color affects the productivity of industrial workers, and are now experimenting with the effect of color on patients. Although Miss Nightingale made no controlled experiments, she observed keenly, and in this instance her observations have been proved correct by later scientific experiments. "Little as we know about the way in which we are affected by form, by color, and light," she wrote, "we do know this, they have actual physical effect." Another observation from her writing of the same period was: "No one who has watched the sick can doubt the fact that some feel stimulus from looking at scarlet flowers, exhaustion from looking at deep blue, etc."

On the other hand, Miss Nightingale recognized that the connection between mind and body is not a one-way street. She said she wished "a little more was thought of the effect of the body on the mind." Today we recognize this fact and no longer say, as we did some years ago, that a patient "is or is not cooperative." We try to understand why he complains, or why he is angry, or why he resists treatment. Miss Nightingale summed up the patient's difficulties so succinctly that we might repeat her words everyday: "Almost any sick person, who behaves decently well, exercises more self-control every moment of his day than you will ever know till your are sick yourself."

Until recently, the recognition given Florence Nightingale by the nursing profession has been primarily for her work in establishing decent standards of nursing care for patients and starting a system of training for those who give the care. Yet perhaps her real genius was in the management field. She may have been so far ahead of her time that we did not appreciate the principles she bequeathed us; we have had to discover them for ourselves. Nurses, like hospital administrators, have gone to industry and business for ideas on better management. So we cannot say that Miss Nightingale has in-

fluenced our profession greatly in this aspect of nursing service. Yet she knew the basic principles of good management and expressed them so well I would like to quote part of her statement on the first requirement of an administrator:

"To be 'in charge' is certainly not only to carry out the proper measures yourself but to see that everyone else does so too. \* \* \* It is neither to do everything yourself nor to appoint a number of people to the (same) duty."

Miss Nightingale had much to say about applying this principle and other principles of good management. In 1858 she advocated conserving the nurse's time and energy in almost the exact same words that were used in 1955 in a recommendation growing out of a recent time study of nursing activities. I quote from the report by a Michigan hospital:

"Following the study made in our hospital we now have a messenger service that brings supplies and drugs to the patient units and transports patients from place to place in the hospital."

Miss Nightingale said that "nothing should be fetched by the nurses," and that "the nurse should never be obliged to quit her floor except for her own dinner and supper." She had a scheme to make this possible—more revolutionary in her day than pneumatic tubes in ours—a "windlass installation," or lift to bring up the patients' food. She also had a scheme for saving work by having hot water piped up to every floor. Without systems of this kind, she said, the nurse is converted into a pair of legs.

She was not only an administrator but an inventor of labor-saving devices. The intercommunicating system at which we marvel today seems only a natural descendant of her suggestion that "the bells of patients should all ring in the passage outside the nurse's door on that story and should have a valve which flies open when its bell rings and remains open in order that the nurse may see who has rung."

Perhaps some of Miss Nightingale's ideas have remained dormant in nurses' consciousness like recessive characteristics. Even today only the more progressive hospitals have written job descriptions for all nursing personnel. We rather timidly suggest that the good staff nurse should receive recognition through higher pay and more responsibility without necessarily having to become an administrator.

Miss Nightingale said in 1858, in her subsidiary notes as to the introduction of female nursing into military hospitals, that the duties of each nurse, senior and junior, and of the orderly should be clearly outlined. She also wrote: "Many women are valuable as nurses who are yet unfit for promotion to head nurses. It appears to me that it would be desirable to have intermediate recompense."

The recent studies to which I referred have analyzed the pattern of interruptions in the head nurse's activities and have shown that the head nurse seldom spends as much as 5 minutes on an activity without being interrupted. Miss Nightingale had a gloomy outlook for people who spent their days in this fashion. She said, "I have never known persons who exposed themselves for years to constant interruption who did not muddle away their intellects by it at last."

Examples of her astute understanding of administration and her inventiveness could be multiplied for the rest of the evening. I shall quote only one more, under the heading of administration: "Unless the matron's authority is supported by the principal medical officer, the patients always suffer." When we read Miss Nightingale's writings we are never in danger of forgetting the patient.

In the field of nursing education, we have been grappling with numerous perplexing problems and divergent ideas in recent years. Here again Miss Nightingale offered many ideas that today would be considered progressive, perhaps even radical. Many students of our system of nursing education maintain that the school of nursing should be independent of the hospital. It is interesting to note that the first school of nursing, the Nightingale School at St. Thomas' Hospital in London, had its own endowment fund and its own board of managers.

The first schools in this country, at Bellevue and Massachusetts General Hospitals, were not established primarily to insure better care of the sick, but to educate nurses. The impetus for these schools came not from the physicians or the hospitals, but from the New York State Charities, and from the Women's Education Association in Boston. Each was directed initially by its own board of managers.

Recent studies of costs of schools of nursing have wrestled with the question, "Should nursing service personnel, head nurses, and others contribute to the education of the students?" In the Nightingale school, the head nurses and the director of nurses were paid part of their salaries from the Nightingale fund for the training of students. So we at least have a precedent for this practice.

Some of us have believed that having the students work full time on the wards was "the good old way." Yet even in Miss Nightingale's era, when theory was a much smaller part of the preparation for any profession than it is now, Miss Nightingale stated as one of the essentials of a training school that "there shall be an organization which by giving proper help in the wards gives probationers time to do their work as pupils as well as give service to patients. Seventy years later we are proposing not a completely different philosophy of training, but rather more of the pupil and less of the service."

Nursing educators are convinced of the necessity of students understanding the reasons behind the things they do—of the value of the case-study method of teaching. Miss Nightingale must be nodding her head in approval. Her spirit perhaps is murmuring "at last." For in 1882 she wrote, "We require a special organization for the purpose of training." Then she explained:

"Training is to teach not only what is to be done \* \* \* not only how to do it, but why such and such a thing is done, and not such and such another; as also to teach symptoms, and what symptoms indicate what of a disease or change, and the 'reason why' of such symptoms."

"Without time for these things, average nurse-probationers degenerate into conceited ward drudges. Without a system for these things, they potter and cobble out their year about the patients, and make not much progress in real nursing—that is, in obeying the physicians' and surgeons' orders intelligently and perfectly."

In her forthright way, Miss Nightingale's predicted dire things for the students if we do not give them proper training.

She summarized so well all the attributes we want in a nurse today that I am going to end with this quotation:

"Training is to teach a nurse to know her business, that is, to observe exactly, to understand, to know exactly, to do, to tell exactly, in such stupendous issues as life and death, health, and disease."

"Training is to enable the nurse to act for the best in carrying out her orders, not as a machine but as a nurse; as an intelligent and responsible being. Training has to make her, not servile, but loyal to medical orders and authorities. True loyalty to orders cannot be without the independent sense of responsibility, which alone secures real trustworthiness."



## Townsend Convention Address

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address I made before the National Townsend Convention at St. Petersburg, Fla., on May 2, 1955:

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Townsend, distinguished guests, delegates, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a source of personal inspiration to see so many of you here at this, your 15th convention, and to look back on your significant accomplishments under the leadership of your beloved Dr. Townsend.

It is fitting that you have chosen to meet in this beautiful city of St. Petersburg. It is known throughout the land as a haven for our retired senior citizens. I am sure that your visit here will be a most pleasant one.

I come to talk with you, briefly, on a matter in which you, and millions of other American citizens, are deeply interested. I come also to pay a tribute to the founder of your organization, Dr. Francis E. Townsend. In all our land, no other person has done more to improve the lot of the senior citizens of our country. His efforts have done much in lightening the burden of our old folks and in making possible for them a better opportunity for a decent livelihood in their retirement.

I know that the pages of history will duly record his tremendous contribution to the well-being of his fellowmen. His perseverance and courage against overwhelming obstacles serve as inspiration to all of us, and to those who will follow along the path toward social and economic justice which he has so clearly marked.

This 15th convention has been most aptly entitled the "Torchlight Convention." Truly, the purpose of this gathering is to light the torch of truth, showing the way to a better tomorrow for the senior citizens of the Nation and for our younger folks to look forward to.

I have always admired the Townsend organization because of its sincere concern with the problems of people. In this day of increasing mechanization and preoccupation with such things as automation, A- and H-bombs, guided missiles, V-8 engines, television, and other mechanical and technical advancements, it is encouraging to find such a dedicated organization striving to obtain for our old folks an equitable share of the Nation's abundance which you have helped to create.

You have made outstanding progress in an area where any progress is difficult. The struggle for social reform is a constant uphill fight. Tremendous pressures for inertia must be overcome before any advances can be made.

Great gains have been won. And although you have not obtained your objective for adequate insurance or retirement benefits for elderly citizens, you have made great progress. You have been a tremendous force for good. You can rightfully claim much of the credit for improvements that have been made in State and Federal legislation pertaining to problems of the aged. You are a force for good because you put human values above everything else.

We need only to refer to history to find illustrations of successful campaigns which have been won against the forces of social inaction. Some of these fights have taken

many decades, others hundreds or even thousands of years.

Consider the struggle over the ages for the realization of the inherent worth and dignity of the human spirit. From the days of Christ, man has been taught that human dignity and spiritual values transcend all other values. The basic elements of Christianity teach that we are all God's children and that we are important in His plan. This teaching survived the tyranny of the Roman Empire, the Dark Ages and was reborn in the renaissance. Down through the centuries man has struggled to break the chains of feudalism, political and religious persecution and to improve his status. Our own forefathers came to America to find a freedom which was denied them in their native lands.

Yes, the struggle for freedom and social progress for the individual has carried down into our own lifetime. We have achieved a measure of freedom and dignity unsurpassed in all of the history of the world. But we continue to fight for an even better life for ourselves and our children and our grandchildren because there still are inequities today which need remedying.

Some of the struggles for social progress have been of a shorter duration, but nonetheless intense. The fight against the inhuman institution of slavery in this country lasted almost a hundred years, and was won at the fearful cost of human lives and suffering in a great Civil War.

Woman suffrage was not achieved until the recent past, after decades and decades of agitation. No, my friends, real social progress is not easy to win. It is a continuing struggle against powerful forces who seek to maintain the status quo and who fear change.

Your program is one which should attract interest from young people as well as old folks. The young man or woman who has the foresight and vision to look ahead, will be interested in the kind of Federal insurance, or social-security program that will adequately provide for them in their twilight years. Young people are naturally concerned about the welfare of their parents and that, too, should interest them in a security program that is adequate in meeting the needs of their elders.

We are not much concerned about the name of a program so long as the objective is to adequately compensate retired citizens and to provide for them the opportunity to properly share in the abundance with which this Nation is blessed.

Any program of social reform which gives a break to the average citizen will always be denounced by those who traditionally have opposed social legislation and social progress.

The objective you seek will one day be realized. It would be unrealistic to expect it to come without great effort and sacrifice, for social reform unfortunately does not move as fast as we would like.

Progress has been slowed down by those who say that the Nation cannot afford a program such as yours or, even programs which are not as far advanced as yours. They ignore the facts that one of our Nation's great problems today is how to meet the challenge of abundance.

We are worried about the great surpluses of farm products. We are concerned because the storehouses are filled with all sorts of electrical gadgets, automobiles, and other items essential for good living. It seems to me that the question is whether we can afford to hold back on programs for adequate retirement benefits. Can we afford to block plans to raise the living level of millions of American workingmen and women and their families who now live on incomes that are not adequate to provide the kind of livelihood and opportunities they are entitled to?

There is something seriously wrong when millions of our fellow citizens are suffering because of the lack of goods which the Na-

tion has in such great abundance. Some folks say we are living beyond our means. They suggest that because of this great abundance we should adjust ourselves downward and backward. Because there is so much of everything they believe people should live on less. That, to me, does not make good sense.

In this great land of ours there is no good reason why everyone should not have the opportunity for a full, happy, and productive life.

In order to build an expanding, full employment economy we must make it possible for our old folks to share in our economic progress. This is one of your aims and it is sound. Increased purchasing power is the key to a brighter tomorrow. Millions of citizens now barely able to exist on meager pensions, inadequate unemployment insurance, old-age benefits, or public assistance today constitute a great potential force for economic advancement if they are given the opportunity to share in the Nation's wealth.

Our Nation was founded by men who had a deep and abiding faith in human progress and a humble respect for the needs of our people. Democracy can be hurt only in times of chaos and in an atmosphere of fear, uncertainty, and hopelessness.

Your own organization was born in the grim days of depression. You remember well that panic which seized our people when our economy was in a state of collapse because of policies which ignored the welfare of the average American. We must remember well the lessons we learned 25 years ago and resist any attempts to again take us down the road to economic disaster.

I regret to say that already I see some of the same danger signals of the 1920's in certain policies of the present administration. The ill-fated "hard money" policy has already forced increases in the interest rates on Government securities and has worked a hardship on borrowers and small businesses. Preoccupation with the alleged needs for encouraging investments has taken precedence over the real needs of the average American for tax relief and resulting increases in purchasing power.

Some people in the administration believe that a float of unemployment is essential in a competitive society in order to keep production on a high level. They overlook human values and fail to see the suffering that comes to several million American families who are compelled to live on inadequate unemployment insurance, public assistance or private charity. They fail to see the tremendous waste in human and natural resources that comes with idle men, idle machines and idle factories.

The real waste in our Nation today is the loss in national output because of this backward adjustment and fear of abundance. This loss last year amounted to something like \$30 billion. It does not make sense that several million workers who desperately seek work in our country today are unable to get jobs, particularly when there is so much work to do. There is a great need, all over the country, for more and better schools. There is a crying need for hospitals and increased medical care for our citizens. In all parts of our great country there is the need for the building of highways and expansion of water, sewer, sanitary systems and the like. There is a great new field for employment in serving the millions of people for whom new avenues have opened for longer vacations, travel, recreation and culture because of automation and increased productive power.

We need not fear abundance. We should not be frightened about a program which would permit all of our citizens, and particularly our deserving senior citizens to fully share in the necessities and luxuries of life which we, as a Nation, have in such great abundance.

If we have the vision, our productive capacity can provide more leisure. It need

not be unemployment and suffering amid plenty. If we have the vision, abundance should be cause for rejoicing, not confusion, fear, and sorrow.

But, shortsighted economic thinking and philosophy which we had hoped was discredited, dead and buried in the great depression, is now making its reincarnation. I am seriously alarmed at some striking resemblances to the predepression administration which are now appearing on the present-day Washington scene.

In my opinion the present administration is not concerning itself with the problems of people but is focusing more and more attention on the health of the stock market, the banking interests, and the profit figures of our giant corporations.

The administration should realize that the needs of our aged are becoming more critical each year. The number of persons over 65 years of age is increasing at the rate of over 1,000 persons a day. Senior citizens now make up over 8 percent of our total population and the proportion is rising rapidly as medical science makes new discoveries which prolong our life expectancy.

The hard fact of the matter is that our social and economic advances have not nearly kept pace with our medical, scientific, and technical advances. Concern for human needs has been shoved aside in the mad race for profits and economic power. But how can we achieve real and lasting progress unless the needs of our aged are given the serious consideration they deserve? Today, even middle-aged workers are being discriminated against in employment opportunities. What happens to these citizens who can no longer find employment? A few have been able to accumulate savings in their lifetime, however meager. But how far will savings go when the cost of living remains at such a high level. Some aged persons are cared for by children or relatives, but we know of the natural desire for independence and freedom of action.

One of the most effective ways which the administration could begin to meet the problems of the aged would be in supporting a housing plan for the older citizens of this Nation.

An example of how this plan could be geared to the needs of our aged is to be found in Cleveland, where a public housing development has set aside 100 apartments, with special provisions such as elevators, nonslip floors, handrails and other fixtures which would make life easier for old people.

Rent in such a project would be low and independence would be assured without isolation, since the apartments are a part of a larger development which would have occupants of all ages. This is the type of program which the Federal Government should undertake on a nationwide scale to reassert its interest and concern for the needs of our growing aged population.

Of course, the Federal Government must begin to face up to the realities of the basic financial needs of the senior citizens. Present levels of benefits under the old-age insurance provisions of the Social Security Act are pitifully inadequate despite recent increases. Even \$100 a month pension would be little enough to buy the bare necessities of life. Millions of Americans are trying to exist today on far less than that. Coverage, while extended recently, still does not provide for aged persons not eligible for benefits at the time of their retirement because of limited original coverage and other disqualifications. Permanently and totally disabled persons are discriminated against under the present law.

I share your views that our present social security law is far from adequate. But it can, and will be improved, as more citizens show an interest in their Government and in legislation that means so much to themselves and their families. We can make our social security law whatever we want it to

be when we arouse enough public support.

Dr. Townsend has displayed wisdom in looking toward his objective. He is realistic enough to know that it requires organization, work, and effort. He has called attention to the great need for unity and action on the part of elderly folks throughout the Nation. He has wisely suggested that you make common cause with organizations of working men and women who are your strongest allies. Labor organizations are made up of members, who like yourself, are deeply concerned about humane problems and about the security of our senior citizens.

Don't forget, there are some in this country who would like to destroy social security, not because they want something better, but because they don't like security at all for the average citizen. They don't like welfare programs. The security that comes regularly with an old-age insurance or pension check—something that is yours as a matter of right—gives to old folks a sense of dignity, self-respect, and independence.

Some folks don't want you to be independent. They don't want you to be in a position where you can't be pushed around or be told what to do. Old-age insurance or retirement pension legislation, or whatever you wish to call it, can be improved to the extent that people desire, if they have the initiative to exert themselves and to apply themselves to the task that must be done.

There is really no need to worry about the financial soundness of the social security system. Social security is just as good and strong as your Government.

The real test, as to whether the Nation can and will adequately provide for retired folks and for all of our people will finally depend upon whether or not we have the real wealth in human and natural resources and in food and other essential goods.

In closing I must say a good word about my friends, Mrs. Ford and Mr. ELLIOTT. They are doing a good job for you in Washington and have the respect of my colleagues in the Congress.

Dr. Townsend is also greatly admired by Members of the Congress for his outstanding leadership in your great cause.

Many Members of Congress have signed the Townsend petition requesting that consideration be given to your program in committees and on the floor of the Congress.

Although this objective has not been achieved, your work has been most fruitful in that it has had a powerful impact on bringing about improvements in social security.

In this beautiful Florida city are a number of people who have come here from my congressional district. I had the pleasure of meeting some dear friends only a few moments ago. I refer to Mr. and Mrs. Robert S. Birch, who are now residents of this city and are with us here in the convention hall. Mr. Birch was a prominent citizen of Reading, Pa., and for many years principal of the boys high school. I was one of his students.

I regret that I can't stay here a few days instead of rushing back to Washington. To all of you, my sincere best wishes. May you enjoy continued success in advancing a just cause to which you are so faithfully devoted.

### Long-Short Haul

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I

include herewith a letter from Chairman Richard Mitchell, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and a statement from the Commission giving its justification for a bill I have introduced today by request of the Commission:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,  
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1955.

The Honorable J. PERCY PRIEST,  
Chairman, Committee on Interstate  
and Foreign Commerce, House of  
Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PRIEST: I am submitting herewith for your consideration 20 copies of a draft of a bill to amend section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, together with a statement of justification of the bill.

After an intensive review of the operation of the fourth section of the act, with particular reference to its impact on the work of the Commission and the ratemaking function of the rail carriers, the Commission has come to the definite conclusion that this section should be amended so as to eliminate therefrom all unnecessary refinements of the long-and-short-haul principle, but at the same time retain the central objective of the fourth section, i. e., departures from the long-and-short-haul principle over direct routes.

The Commission would be very grateful for your assistance in introducing the bill and giving it early consideration.

With kindest regards, I remain,

Sincerely,

RICHARD F. MITCHELL,  
Chairman.

#### JUSTIFICATION

The attached draft of proposed bill is intended to amend section 4 (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to remove therefrom all unnecessary and unduly burdensome refinements of the long-and-short-haul principle, which principle was originally designed to prevent the specific discriminatory practice of charging more for a shorter than for a longer haul. That principle is still valid today.

Section 4 (1) of the act now prohibits any common carrier subject to part I or part III thereof from charging or receiving any greater compensation for the transportation of passengers, or like kind of property, for a shorter than for a longer distance over the same line or route in the same direction, the shorter being included within the longer distance, or from charging any greater compensation as a through rate than the aggregate of the intermediate rates subject to the provisions of part I or III. It further provides that upon application the Commission may, in special cases, after investigation, authorize such carriers to charge less for the longer than for the shorter distances, and that the Commission may from time to time prescribe the extent to which such designated carrier may be relieved from the operation of the section, except that in exercising such authority the Commission shall not permit the establishment of any charge to or from the more distant point that is not reasonably compensatory for the service performed.

The proposed amendment is specifically designed to make the fourth section self-operating with respect to the right of a circuitous route to meet the rate or rates legally established between competitive points over the more direct routes. No further authorization from the Commission would be required other than the standards laid down by other sections of the act. As an incident of this suggested change we are proposing to remove from section 4 the so-called reasonably compensatory provision. This, in our opinion, would eliminate from section 4 all of the unnecessary refinements of the long-and-short-haul principle, would terminate our responsibility with respect to



fourth-section departures over circuitous routes, and would limit our jurisdiction to authorizations of relief over direct routes, upon application and after investigation, where special justification for such relief is shown.

Experience has demonstrated that the public interest is not being served by the imposition of the restrictions in question. The history of their administration has proved them to be excessively burdensome to all concerned. Together they have resulted in disproportionate expenditures of time, labor, and funds by both the carriers and the Commission in comparison with the relatively small benefits derived. Moreover, almost all of the dissatisfaction with section 4, which is expressed periodically by carriers and shippers alike, appears to stem from the same burdensome provisions.

Section 4 has been highly controversial since its inception both as to its substantive provisions and as to the manner and extent of its administration. In implementing this section the Commission initially adopted a vigorous policy, but due to the early attitude of the courts, especially the narrow interpretation given the words "under substantially similar circumstances and conditions" (which were contained in the original act) in *I. C. C. v. Alabama Midland Ry. Co.* (163 U. S. 144 (1897)), the Commission was compelled to abandon, at least temporarily, its forceful approach.

The enactment of the Mann-Elkins Act, June 8, 1910, however, gave new life to the section by eliminating the phrase "under substantially similar circumstances and conditions"; and, as set forth in that act, section 4 appeared to contain all the essentials necessary for effective and efficient administration. The Transportation Act of 1920, however, added two refinements, viz, the

"reasonably compensatory" provision and the so-called "equidistant" provision which proved to be troublesome. The latter provision was repealed by the Transportation Act of 1940, at which time the "reasonably compensatory" provision did not appear to be quite so objectionable by comparison. In retrospect, however, it is now equally clear that the carriers should not be required to secure our permission for the publication of rates over circuitous routes equivalent to the going rates over direct routes when in their managerial discretion such rates are necessary because of competitive factors.

The Commission is now firmly of the view that the "reasonably compensatory" provision no longer serves any useful purpose, and that it may well be eliminated from section 4 without jeopardizing the public interest. And, in this connection, we wish to point out that under other sections of the act the Commission is constantly seeking assurance that all rates subject to its jurisdiction, including those published under section 4, are not unjust or unreasonable, unjustly discriminatory, nor unduly prejudicial or preferential. For this reason we do not believe that the proposed amendment would detract substantially from our jurisdiction, but would, on the other hand, allow us greater discretion in the administration of this section, which should inure to the benefit of the carriers and the public as well.

It is our view that the central principle of the fourth section, i. e., control of departures from the long-and-short-haul principle over the direct routes—is sound and should be retained, and that enactment of the proposed amendment would serve to streamline section 4. It would likewise enhance our administrative effectiveness and relieve the carriers of an unnecessary burden.

## Public-Opinion Survey—11th Illinois Congressional District

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, for the fifth consecutive year, I have conducted a public-opinion survey among the constituents of my congressional district, and this year mailed out 19,700 questionnaires, of which 250 were returned undelivered, showing a net mailing of 19,450.

To date, 3,520 questionnaires have been returned and tabulated, which represents 18.1 percent of the net mailing and which, according to professional sampling criteria, is a very good return.

Besides the 4,200 people on my semi-monthly newsletter mailing list, the questionnaire was sent into every precinct in the district to people picked at random without prior knowledge of their political affiliation, so that the distribution accomplished was as fair as was humanly possible and indicates that a typical cross-section of the constituency was sampled. The results of the survey are as follows:

	Yes	Per- cent	No	Per- cent	No an- swer	Per- cent
1. Are you in favor of the United States continuing as a member of the United Nations?	2,445	69.5	996	28.3	79	2.2
2. Do you favor further arms and military aid for foreign nations?	1,579	44.9	1,753	49.8	188	5.3
3. Do you favor continued economic aid (point 4 program) to foreign nations for the development of backward areas?	1,759	50.0	1,622	46.0	139	4.0
4. Do you approve of the Republican foreign policy in general?	2,004	56.9	1,066	30.3	450	12.8
5. Do you approve of the Eisenhower administration to date?	2,298	65.3	840	23.9	382	10.8
6. Do you approve of using United States military forces to defend the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, just off the Chinese mainland, if these islands are attacked by Chinese Communist forces?	1,221	34.7	2,069	58.8	230	6.5
7. Do you approve of using United States military forces to defend Formosa if it is attacked by Chinese Communists?	2,206	62.7	1,136	32.3	178	5.0
8. Do you favor continuation of the Federal Government's low-rent public housing program?	1,921	54.6	1,477	41.9	122	3.5
9. Do you favor the Federal Government reinsuring privately run voluntary hospitalization and surgical plans?	1,530	43.5	1,750	49.7	240	6.8
10. Do you approve of President Eisenhower's 10-year highway-construction program requiring the expenditure of \$101 billion?	2,680	76.1	717	20.4	123	3.5
11. Do you favor the administration's educational proposal in which the Federal Government share would be \$1.1 billion, of which \$200 million would be in grants, the rest in loans to support local and State school bonds?	2,539	72.1	842	23.9	139	4.0
12. Do you favor a program of universal military training requiring every man to spend some time in military training and then have to join the Reserves?	2,320	65.9	1,103	31.3	97	2.8
13. Do you approve of statehood for Hawaii with a population of 499,794 (1950 census)?	2,696	76.6	674	19.1	150	4.3
14. Do you approve of statehood for Alaska with a population of 108,543 (1950 census)?	2,664	75.7	697	19.8	159	4.5
15. Do you favor revealing to the American public more of our foreign agreements such as the recently disclosed Yalta documents?	2,852	81.0	567	16.1	101	2.9
16. Do you believe we are spending enough for military security? (The estimated budget expenditure for 1956 is \$62.4 billion; 65 percent of this or \$40.5 billion is for major national military security.)	2,768	78.7	487	13.8	265	7.5
17. Do you think the average American company can pay its employees a guaranteed annual wage?	1,202	34.1	2,067	58.7	251	7.2
18. Do you favor President Eisenhower's conducting personal talks with the heads of the Russian and British Governments?	2,311	65.7	1,045	29.7	164	4.6
19. Do you approve of a questionnaire of this type as a means of helping a Congressman to know the thinking of his constituents?	3,451	98.0	38	1.1	31	.9

Five of the questions asked in this year's survey were identical in content

and similarly worded in 1954 and 1953, and a comparison of the results over

these 3 years is as follows:

	Percentages							
	1955			1954			1953 <sup>1</sup>	
	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No
1. Are you in favor of the United States continuing as a member of the United Nations?.....	69.5	28.3	2.2	67.0	29.9	3.1	64.1	35.9
2. Do you favor further arms and military aid for foreign nations?.....	44.9	49.8	5.3	45.7	46.4	7.9	44.7	55.3
3. Do you favor continued economic aid (point 4 program) to foreign nations for the development of backward areas?.....	50.0	46.0	4.0	54.4	38.8	6.8	43.3	56.7
4. Do you approve of the Republican foreign policy in general?.....	56.9	30.3	12.8	52.9	36.6	10.5	78.5	21.5
5. Do you approve of the Eisenhower administration to date?.....	65.3	23.9	10.8	58.0	25.9	16.1	84.2	15.8

<sup>1</sup> It is to be noted that in the percentage of "yes" and "no" answers tabulated in the 1953 questionnaire, the "no answers" were not included in the percentage breakdown.

## Soroptimist of the Month: Congresswoman From the First Idaho District

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD at this time an article from the April 1955 issue of the American Soroptimist which pays tribute to the charming lady from Idaho, the able and conscientious Congresswoman from the First District, Mrs. GRACIE FROST. Mrs. FROST is the only soroptimist in the United States Congress, and this outstanding organization has recognized her devoted service to the good people of her district, State, and Nation by naming her as the soroptimist of the month.

Mrs. FROST and I both came to Congress in 1953. Since the beginning of the 83d Congress I have had the privilege and pleasure of serving with Mrs. FROST on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and on several of the subcommittees of that committee. Consequently I have had many opportunities to observe her effective work and her development into a very capable legislator. She has performed admirably for the good people of her district and is dedicated to their service. Her recognition as the soroptimist of the month is a reward she justly deserves.

Therefore I have asked permission to place in the RECORD this article so that our colleagues may know the honor that has been conferred upon our Gracie.

The article follows:

**SOROPTIMIST OF THE MONTH: CONGRESSWOMAN FROM THE FIRST IDAHO DISTRICT—GRACIE FROST, CALDWELL (IDAHO) CLUB**

Service—personal, intimate service to the people and the community has been the keynote in the rise of Mrs. GRACIE FROST, personable Congresswoman from the First Idaho District and the only Soroptimist in Congress.

Twenty years ago she was a young deputy in the county clerk's office, where her more interesting work was the issuance of marriage licenses and the making out of the county warrants. These were depression days, and conditions in the agricultural area were rough.

The young and gracious county official made the problem of each person who came to her her own. In businesslike, personal style, she helped those caught in the complexity of filing legal papers work out their problem.

Friends saw in the dynamic, freckle-faced young redhead a person qualifying for higher responsibility—maybe county clerk—at a future date. For 9 years, she dispensed pleasant, personal service in this position, winning political opponents as well as political friends by the service she gave.

Then came the step-up. The position of county treasurer seemed to be available, and Gracie declared herself a candidate.

"If there is a person in Canyon County Mrs. FROST does not know by first name, it's because she hasn't visited the maternity ward in the hospital lately," a political op-

ponent remarked in discussing the election prospects.

Five consecutive times the voters trooped to the polls to elect GRACIE FROST—always by heavy majorities. And she smilingly continued to dispense the same service.

"She listens too well and doesn't talk enough," was the bitter comment of an opponent who could not trap Mrs. FROST in public debate over issues beyond the jurisdiction of her office. She would discuss freely the problems of her office and the matters pertaining to its efficient operation, and confined herself to matters which were her business.

Her campaigning consisted largely of meeting people and listening. Everyone wanted to tell her how she should campaign. She listened to everyone—and they surprisingly found themselves campaigning for her.

In 1950 she announced her candidacy for the congressional position from the First District. "Gracie is overreaching herself," her political opponents chortled, contending that she was not qualified for so high an office.

Her friends, knowing the First Idaho District, also feared she was overreaching—but for a different reason. The district extends from the Snake River in the southwest, northward and eastward, and includes the panhandle. Its interests include forestry, mining, grazing, cattle raising, as well as irrigation farming.

First District Congressmen have traditionally come from the area north of the Salmon River, which is the heart of the mining-timber area. And here was a woman, from the heart of the irrigated-farming area, seeking to represent the lumber and mining interests of a State which included such vast enterprises as the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine, one of the greatest silver-lead producers in the Nation.

GRACIE FROST calmly set out on her campaign, knowing that she would not be able to shake the hands of all the 100,000 eligible voters on the isolated farms along the Lemhi, in the forest camps of the Sawtooths, or the mining camps along the Lochsa, all in her district, but determined to give it a try. She concentrated her efforts in north Idaho, the region where all believed that she would be weak. She visited the lumber camps, conferred with union officials and others in the mining camps. Five and ten persons in isolated communities back in the mountain areas on a dirt road beside some mountain stream were apt to find themselves shaking hands with a candidate for Congress.

"Covering" the First District in a campaign was an undertaking which made strong men shudder at the prospect, and yet the smiling, friendly, redhead fought for votes where it counted—at the level of the voters themselves—and did a more thorough job than had ever before been done. In the general election, she was defeated by a small margin. But her defeat came not in the northern counties where she had staged her battle, but in the counties closer to her home, where she believed her friends could carry the burden.

Characteristically, Gracie took her defeat in good humor. "Guess I should have spent more time at home," she said, "but, good gosh, I couldn't be home and up there, too."

She settled down in the real-estate business in her home town of Nampa—a city of 16,000. There was little question that she would try again, although she says that she was needed by her husband, Jack, into seeking election in 1952.

Once defeated, the comely redhead was no longer considered invulnerable by her opponents in 1952, they threw all their weight against her along the entire line from Snake River to the Canadian border. Her opponent, Dr. John T. Wood, was the same man who had defeated her in 1950.

Gracie just worked a little harder. Midway in the campaign she was talking in a husky voice a couple of octaves below her normally soft and quite deep speaking voice and certainly a number of degrees harsher. By election time, she was whispering hoarsely.

But her assurances were accepted. In a State which elected Republicans to all congressional positions but one, and which elected Republicans to all major State offices but one, GRACIE FROST, a Democrat, went to Washington from the First District.

Mrs. FROST was born in Boone County, Ark., and was reared in the Boise Valley in which she has since resided. Her community activities have been legion since the days in which as deputy county clerk with a half dozen other young kindred spirits, as well as a few older heads, she formed the nucleus of the Democratic Party in Canyon County.

She was active in forming the Caldwell, Idaho, Soroptimist Club when she was county treasurer and served as its first president in 1946. That year, under her leadership, the club laid the foundation for the expansion of the Girl Scout movement in the county seat. The work was not accomplished entirely by delegation of authority. During her lunch hour, Gracie often was seen doing a job of selling the organization's principles to a businessman, a store clerk, a father—anyone who seemed to have a moment on his hands—with missionary-like zeal. She served also as regional treasurer for the Soroptimists.

The pioneers who settled in the small valleys that dot her district, or who prospected in the mountains had only the forces of nature to conquer. Gracie, who spends an average of 16 hours a day on the job, would have found in pioneering a gentle, back-to-earth restfulness had she had an opportunity for a spell of it during the heights of her political campaigning last fall. It was a real uphill battle for reelection, but she won.

Her vivaciousness and enthusiasm left no doubt in the minds of her listeners that the Congresswoman from the Idaho First District was a public servant, and enjoying every moment of it.

## Amendment to Section 406 of the Federal Seed Act

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 406 of the Federal Seed Act.

The purpose of this proposed amendment to one of the penalty provisions of the Federal Seed Act is intended to remove the stigma of having petty and unknowing violations of the Federal Seed Act by reputable businessmen in the seed industry being classified as criminal violations.

This amendment will enable the Government to hereafter have the option to bring civil proceedings for violations of the Federal Seed Act in addition to criminal actions. In civil proceedings the Government will not have to prove intent, but in criminal actions to know-



ingly violate the provisions of the act will be a factor in determining the violator's guilt.

### Surplus Wheat and Corn Processed Into Flour and Meal Should Be Made Available to the Unemployed of the Nation

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this morning I appeared before a subcommittee of the Senate Agricultural Committee in support of Senate bill 661 which will authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process wheat into flour and corn into meal for distribution to the unemployed and their families. S. 661 is similar to a bill I introduced on

the subject in the House of Representatives.

My statement before the Senate subcommittee follows:

Mr. Chairman, S. 661 is similar to H. R. 2851 with the exception of amendments adopted by the House Committee on Agriculture. I introduced similar legislation in the House because the subject of processing wheat into flour and corn into meal is of great interest to the unemployed people in my congressional district who can use surplus commodities to better advantage. If they are processed as provided for by this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, at the present time over 18 percent of the civilian labor force in my congressional district is unemployed and is principally composed of coal miners and railroaders who have exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits, liquidated their savings accounts, borrowed on or have taken the cash value of their insurance policies and today are living on public assistance and surplus commodities.

To give you some idea of the overall picture of unemployment in my congressional district, let me call your attention to the following chart that describes the number of families and persons receiving surplus commodities:

*Surplus commodities*

County	Number o. families	Percentage of all families	Total number of persons	Percentage of county population
Blair.....	10,801	26.8	32,561	23.3
Centre.....	2,939	15.9	9,362	14.2
Clearfield.....	9,988	42.2	37,179	43.3
Total.....	23,728	28.8	79,402	27.1
Entire State of Pennsylvania.....			1,020,963	19.7

<sup>1</sup> Percent of State population of 10,498,012.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, before you receive coupons for surplus commodities you have to be certified as eligible by a local welfare agency.

Therefore, these figures are official and have been verified not only by the State of Pennsylvania but also by the county commissioners in each of the three counties in my congressional district.

*Surplus commodities by carload lots to Mar. 1, 1955*

County	Beans	Beef	Butter	Cheese	Dried milk	Rice	Short- ening
Blair.....	2	16	21	19	18	1	16
Centre.....	1/2	4	3	5	5	1/2	4
Clearfield.....	4	5	16	14	16	1	13
Total number of carloads.....	6 1/2	25	40	38	39	2 1/2	33
Grand total.....			184				

Mr. Chairman, there is no denial of the fact that these figures are startling and are an answer to those who smugly insist that there is no acute unemployment problem in the labor-surplus areas of the Nation.

Think of it, Mr. Chairman, according to the Pennsylvania department of property and supplies, in this great industrial State of Pennsylvania, out of its 10 1/2 million residents, nearly 10 percent, or 1,020,963 are living on surplus commodities.

In this congressional district comprising Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties, out of a population of 292,000, nearly 28 percent or 79,402 persons are receiving surplus commodities.

Mr. Chairman, these figures are startling for they truly portray the extent of unemployment in my congressional district as well as in the entire State of Pennsylvania.

As I said in the beginning of this statement, the processing of wheat into flour and corn into meal will enable the families of the unemployed to use these surplus commodities to good advantage since many housewives still bake their own bread and muffins

and can put the flour and meal to good use in arranging the family diet.

Mr. Chairman, this idea of processing wheat into flour and corn into meal as provided for in S. 661 will not establish a precedent in the handling and distribution of surplus commodities, because over a period of years the United States Department of Agriculture has been distributing canned beef and gravy in processed form.

According to the report of the United States Department of Agriculture, during the period from March to December of 1953, they purchased nearly 172 million pounds of canned beef and gravy for distribution here in the United States, while nearly 12 million more pounds of canned beef and gravy were purchased for export, mainly to Greece and Germany. The cost of these purchases was in excess of \$72 million.

Mr. Chairman, if it has been possible to put beef and gravy in a tin container for distribution, I can see no reason why wheat and corn should not be processed into flour and meal for the unemployed of the Nation. Therefore, I hope that S. 661 will receive the favorable consideration of this committee.

### Dentists and Their Families Can Profit Greatly by Inclusion in Social Security

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ROBERT W. KEAN**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter in the Record which I have written. A new group has been formed to undertake what I consider a very worthwhile cause. The cause is the inclusion of all self-employed dentists throughout the United States in social-security coverage starting in 1955. Being a member of the House Ways and Means Committee who has devoted many years of study and thought to the inclusion of self-employed professionals in the system, I am fully in accord with this effort. The group is the Congress of American Dentists for OASI. The following letter, addressed to the president of the group, I think fully expresses my views on the importance of the goal they are trying to achieve:

MAY 9, 1955.

J. GARRETT REILLY, D. D. S.,  
President, Congress of American Dentists  
for OASI, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. REILLY: I am extremely pleased that the Congress of American Dentists for OASI has been founded and is prepared to work on a nationwide basis to help get social security for the self-employed members of your important profession.

Now that you have organized to accomplish this worthwhile objective, I would like to point out that your group has no time to lose if the dentists of this Nation—approximately 75,000 strong—expect to receive coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance system without being penalized.

Let me explain what I mean by this word "penalized."

Social-security benefits are calculated on the average wage received by a worker from January 1, 1951, until he reaches the age of retirement. However, the law provides that a worker, in making this calculation, may drop out his 4 years of lowest earnings.

Zero earnings under covered employment, of course, will pull down his average wage.

Other professional groups first brought into the system this year will not be penalized because they can drop out the 4 years, 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954.

However, if dentists were not included until after April 15, 1956, they would have zero earnings for 1955 to pull their average wage down. For example, one whose wage computation is based on the maximum \$4,200 for 4 years but must include a year of zero earnings has an average wage for the 5 years of \$3,560, instead of having benefit entitlement figured on \$4,200 for the period.

But, as the self-employed only pay their social-security tax for 1955 when they pay their income tax on April 15, 1956, if dentists are brought into the system before that date and pay their 1955 social-security tax then, they would have no years of zero earnings on their record and, as a result, would get the maximum social-security benefits if they earn \$4,200 a year.

Important too is the fact that, under the social-security system, those nearing the age of 65 will be entitled to coverage if they are in the program half the time between 1951 and the date they reach the age of 65 (after using the drop out) with a minimum necessary coverage of 6 quarters (18 months).

Therefore, the sooner those nearing retirement age can join the system the better for them.

In the past some associations have opposed dentists entering the social-security system largely on the theory that many dentists never retire and, therefore, would not receive the old-age-retirement benefits themselves.

Of course, we know that a good many dentists, men whose work is very delicate and who almost always must stand on their feet, do retire at or about the age of 65. However, even if the old argument of some of the organizations was true, we must face the fact that, unfortunately, some dentists do die leaving widows and minor children and some dentists are forced to retire because of ill health.

If my bill, H. R. 6049, to include dentists becomes law what can social security mean to the self-employed dentist and his family? If self-employed dentists are given coverage, a dentist who has an average net income of \$4,200 a year, or more, and who has a wife and two children, would have protection for them if he died in the amount of \$200 a month tax free until the older child reached the age of 18. At that time, the monthly benefit would drop to \$162.80 a month until the younger child reaches the age of 18. After that there would be no benefits until the widow reached that age of 65 when her benefits would be resumed at the rate of \$81.40 a month unless she remarried.

If the children were age 6 and 4, these payments would amount to \$32,000 assuming that the mother and children live until the younger child reaches the age of 18.

The widow, if she lives to age 65 would then have a life expectancy of 14 or more years and her benefits, in addition to the above mentioned \$32,000, would be in excess of \$13,000.

It should be mentioned in this connection that the social-security system would also provide a maximum lump-sum payment of \$255 to cover funeral expenses.

An income of \$81.40 a month is equivalent to \$976 a year. It would take \$32,500 of accumulated capital invested in Government bonds at 3 percent to produce an annual income of \$976.

I will also mention the benefits available to dentists upon retirement. If a dentist should retire after the age of 65 and had earned an average of \$4,200 a year, he would receive a monthly tax-free income of \$108.50 which would be increased to \$162.80 when his wife also reaches the age of 65. At the age of 72 old-age-insurance benefits would be paid to him as an outright annuity.

In addition, the law provides for a waiver of premium for a person who becomes totally disabled before age 65. Because of this protection, a disabled individual can qualify for full benefits at 65 even though full contributions have not been paid.

For all of this protection the dentist with a net income of \$4,200 or more a year would pay premiums of \$126 annually. The premium would rise by a series of steps beginning in 1960 to a maximum premium—beginning with the year 1975—of \$252 annually.

Many dentists have already received social-security credits. Among these are those who have served in the Armed Forces, dentists employed in medical departments of business and industry, those employed on hospital staffs, laboratories, and clinics operated for a profit, and many of those employed by educational institutions and other non-profit groups. Under the present law, however, self-employed dentists have little opportunity to participate in the program and maintain an insured status.

With the present high income-tax rates, it is difficult for any individual to set aside substantial savings for his dependents. This, of course, is particularly true for those with moderate incomes. The young dentist starting his private practice usually has high

expenses and heavy family obligations at a time when his income is relatively low. Death of the young dentist at this time is a real hardship on his widow and children and social-security payments might be the one thing which could keep the family together.

It is difficult to have a comprehensive and fair social-security system with some individuals covered and some individuals not covered. I believe that self-employed dentists, if fully informed, would generally favor coverage. However, knowing the deep respect Congress holds for dentists I realize that persuading that legislative body to include you will continue to be difficult unless representative groups of dentists favor inclusion. Possibly the Congress of American Dentists for OASI of which you are president will aid in starting the necessary movement.

I do feel that the plan that you outlined to me of urging all of the dentists in the United States to record their views, pro or con, about inclusion in the OASI system by mailing a postcard to you at the above address is excellent. This expression of opinion, if those dentists sign their names and addresses on the postcard could make a sales-worthy exhibit to offer the Congress as sure proof that the great majority of dentists want social security.

Another thing to remember is that Members of Congress, when they go home for adjournment often visit their dentists for a checkup. Dentists interested in social security can greatly advance their cause by expressing their views on social security to their Congressmen at that time.

Cordially yours,

ROBERT W. KEAN,  
Member of Congress, 12th District,  
New Jersey.

### McGregor Will Hold Conferences in District

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. J. HARRY MCGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, since I have been in Congress I have always attempted to keep in close contact with the people of the 17th Ohio District, whom I represent.

While a Congressman is expected to have a broad grasp of national and international matters, and to give information on many troublesome subjects, I deem it most advisable to keep in touch with the people of our district so that I might have their views and endeavor to be of service to them in their personal problems.

Having been assured by the leadership that the Congress will not be in session, I will again, this year, follow the procedure of holding meetings in the courthouses of the 7 counties in my district.

I have established the following schedule:

Monday and Tuesday, August 22 and 23, Ashland, Ashland County.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 24 and 25, Mansfield, Richland County.

Friday and Saturday, August 26 and 27, Mount Vernon, Knox County.

Monday and Tuesday, August 29 and 30, Delaware, Delaware County.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 31 and September 1, Newark, Licking County.

Friday and Saturday, September 2 and 3, Millersburg, Holmes County.

Tuesday and Wednesday, September 6 and 7, Coshocton, Coshocton County.

Weekdays 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Saturday conferences will last only until noon, when the courthouse closes.

It is surprising how much can be accomplished when a citizen and his Congressman can sit down and talk over national and personal problems.

No appointments are necessary for these conferences and I urge any or all of my constituents to meet with me on the date most convenient to them.

With the knowledge thus obtained, I know I will be better able to truly represent them in the Congress of the United States.

### The Asian-African Conference

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss briefly the Asian-African Conference that took place in Bandung, Indonesia, on April 18-24 last. It is important that its implications as they affect the United States and the free world be carefully studied by us. We belong to the legislative branch of our Government and many of our decisions have a direct bearing on what will result from the decisions made at Bandung.

It should be a matter of gratification for us that when 29 nations of Asia and Africa met, the world found out that democracy is strongly entrenched in that area; that despite the efforts of neutralists and Communists to slant the Conference against the free world, those who believe in freedom asserted themselves and succeeded in defeating all attempts to make of the Conference a sounding board for neutralism and communism.

That we did not suspect this unexpected strength of democracy in Asia and Africa is a lesson we should remember. It shows that we have more friends than we know. In not knowing that we have such stalwart allies we are guilty of either indifference or neglect, and this we should correct at once. This is the first moral that we should draw from the Bandung meeting.

The second lesson is to be drawn from the fact that in Bandung the conferees exercised restraint of the highest order. Their utterances and decisions showed dignity and sobriety. No attacks were made based on racism. Where we feared the color line would be drawn because of the manner the participating countries were selected, nothing in the proceedings of the Conference showed that any of the delegates were animated by racism. Asia and Africa, through their delegates, extended to us the hand of friendship and good will. We should, in equal reciprocity, grasp that hand of



friendship and good will. Here is where we can together lay the groundwork for peace for all mankind.

The third lesson is that we should not be too hasty in judging the motives and purposes of other nations. When the Conference was first announced, it was with misgivings that the convening of the meeting was received. Many fears were expressed. As a result, our Government, through President Eisenhower, failed to send a message of greetings to the Conference. This is unfortunate. We should have been the first ones to welcome the Conference and to send our official greetings to the conferees, the majority of whom turned out to be our best friends and allies. Here the State Department failed us in not giving our Government the correct intelligence and background information.

The fourth lesson is that as Ernest Lindley in his column in *Newsweek* aptly said, we cannot discount the Asians who in the Conference showed they have statesmen and diplomats of the highest caliber, seasoned and mature, who can match the best of Europe and America. Among these I wish to single out a former Member of this House, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, who was the Philippines' chief delegate in the Bandung Conference. All the press dispatches were unanimous in acclaiming him as the leader of the democratic forces in the Conference. The Filipino people should be proud that in a meeting of 29 Asian and African nations it was a Filipino voice that spoke for democracy so effectively that the whole world listened.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Record General Romulo's speech that will go down in history as a classic that turned the tide for the free world in Bandung:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CARLOS P. ROMULO, MEMBER OF THE CABINET, CHAIRMAN OF THE PHILIPPINE DELEGATION TO THE ASIAN-AFRICAN CONFERENCE, BANDUNG, INDONESIA

I am proud to bring to this Conference the greetings of the President and people of the Republic of the Philippines.

We of the Philippines have a profound sense of the great historic events dramatized by this unique gathering; we were, may I remind you, the first of the new nations to emerge in the great rearrangement of the world which began after the end of the Second World War. Our Republic came to being, freely and peacefully, on July 4, 1946. Since that time we have watched with proud solidarity and a feeling of oneness the establishment of the other independent nations of a free Asia, so old and yet so new. We have in these 9 years taken our stand firmly behind the struggle of every people to become master of its own fate, to enjoy its own identity, to be responsible for its own acts, to join in the immense task of building a new structure of human well-being and free institutions, the task, indeed, of changing the face of the world. To the peoples of Africa, already setting forth on this same path, we pledge our friendship and all the moral and practical support within our power to give as they join us of Asia in the great universal effort to better man's estate.

We come as members of one great family long separated from each other. In this family reunion we are here to talk of man's estate. But I do not think it will serve us well to have come here from our many corners of the earth to shroud the truth about man's estate in platitudes, propaganda, or

easy self-deception. The world is too harsh a place for this, our problems too great, too perilous, too complicated to allow us this luxury. This conference will justify itself if we share our views frankly and realistically as brothers should. We will serve each other if we examine ourselves, if we state the issues and problems plainly as we see them, if we clarify, as far as we can, our needs, our choices, our goals—and our obstacles. Let us seek a true meeting of minds on those we share in common and where there are differences, let us try at least to understand them.

All who are represented here are certainly concerned with the issues of (1) colonialism and political freedom, (2) racial equality, and (3) peaceful economic growth. The history of the world in our time turns on the ways in which these issues are met and resolved, or not met and not resolved. We are part, all of us, of a time of great transformation, for each of us and for all the people on earth. It is a trying, difficult, dangerous time—but with it all a good time to be living in. Never before, surely, have so many people been consciously a part of the history through which they were living. We in this room are, for our brief moment, a part of this history. How do we see it? How do we understand it?

To begin with, the very fact that we have come together here in this manner illustrates the great new fact that these issues of freedom, equality, and growth are no longer merely national problems but world problems. Indeed, the United Nations was created as an attempt to grapple with this great new fact. In one sense, this conference suggests that for the peoples of Asia and Africa the United Nations has inadequately met the need for establishing common ground for peoples seeking peaceful change and development. But I think we must also say that if the United Nations has been weak and limited in its progress toward these goals, it is because the United Nations is still much more a mirror of the world than an effective instrument for changing it. It has been in existence only 9 years, and through that time always subject to all the pressures and difficulties of national rivalries and power conflicts, large and small. It is a place where man, not quite yet a reasonable animal, is trying very hard to become one.

We do not have to be satisfied with the rate of progress being made. But neither can we be blind to the great changes that have taken place in so short a time. The world is a very different place from what it was a scant 15 years ago, and hence the United Nations is a very different body from the old League of Nations. A primary difference is the presence of the new spokesmen for Asian and African peoples who never allow the Western representatives to forget that the United Nations Charter pledged the freedom and self-determination of all peoples and that there are peoples in Asia and Africa who take that pledge with literal seriousness, and who will not rest until it is redeemed.

The majority of independent nations represented here won their independence only within the last decade. Who would have been bold enough, 20 years ago, to predict that this would be so? Who will be bold enough now to say how soon or how slowly those peoples in Africa strong enough to win it will acquire the right to face their own problems in their own way on their own responsibility? The handwriting of history is spread on the wall: But not everybody reads it the same way or interprets similarly what he reads there. We know the age of European empire is at an end; not all Europeans know that yet. Not all Asians or Africans have been or are still aware that they must make themselves the conscious instruments of historic change.

Political freedom has been won by many different means. The British surrendered

power in southern Asia because they knew they could no longer maintain it and were wise enough to base their action on reality. The French and Dutch had to be forced to the same conclusion. The United States has at times appeared to us lacking in consistency and vigor in upholding the right of non-self-governing peoples to independence. It has on some issues leaned heavily in favor of colonial powers and has sometimes disheartened us because of its failure to make its actions dovetail with its ideals of equality and freedom. We think that this was more than regrettable; we think it has been unwise. Let it be stated in fairness however that uniquely among the colonial powers the United States in our case made a formal pledge of independence, fixed a date for it 10 years in advance, and fully and honorably redeemed that pledge. True, we fought ceaselessly for our freedom and never gave up our struggle and we earned it when it came. But we of the Philippines have directly experienced the basic good faith of the United States in our own relationship and we feel that the principles upon which it was based will ultimately prevail.

It is to be hoped, however, that this conference will help remind all the Western powers that the issue of political independence for subject peoples does not depend on their goodwill or slow access of wisdom or virtue. The age of empire is being helped into oblivion by the aroused will and action of people determined to be masters of their own fate. Those of us here who have already won our independence were only the initiators of this process. All the others, almost all now in Africa, stand at various points along their own roads to full self-determination. There is much, of course, one cannot readily foresee. But everything we know and understand about history assures us that whatever new travails the future holds, the old structure of Western empire will and must pass from the scene. Will it expire quietly and in dignity? Will it go out crashing violently? That will depend on many things. But the end is not in doubt.

There are at least three things more to be said here about this matter of national political freedom:

First, it is perilously easy in this world for national independence to be more fiction than fact. Because it expresses the deepest desires of so many people in the world, it can be unscrupulously used as a shibboleth, as a façade, as an instrument for a new and different kind of subjection. I know that on this score there are violently different opinions in the world. I can recall how new nations like India, Indonesia, and Ceylon were called puppets of imperialism when they were newly born to freedom. And of course, the Philippine Republic has been described by these same sources as a mere tool of the United States. On the other hand, there is the way some of us view the position of certain other countries which from our own perspective we consider as subservient to other powers. I wonder if in such countries you could read in the press or hear in the public speeches of their spokesmen anything resembling the open criticism and other attacks that were common fare in places like India and the Philippines even before independence? I wonder if any of the spokesmen of these countries would ever speak as freely in criticism of the bigger country to which they feel friendly or allied as, say, we in the Philippines speak our minds about the United States? I am sure you will forgive my frankness, but in this land of the ingenious and artistic *wajang*, of the wonderful Indonesian shadow play and puppet shows, I think we ought to say plainly to each other when we think a puppet is a puppet.

Secondly, is political freedom achieved when the national banner rises over the seat

of government, the foreign ruler goes, and the power passes into the hands of our own leaders? Is the struggle for national independence the struggle to substitute a local oligarchy for the foreign oligarchy? Or is it just the beginning of the conquest of real freedom by the people of the land? Is there political freedom where only one political party may rule? Is there political freedom where dissent from the policy of the government means imprisonment or worse? It strikes me that autocratic rule, control of the press, and the police state are exactly the worst features of some colonialist systems against which we have fought all our lives and against which so many of us are still fighting. Is this really the model of the freedom we seek? Or is it the free interplay of contending parties, the open competition of ideas and political views in the market place, the freedom of a man to speak up as he chooses, be he right or wrong? I know there are many possible answers to these questions. But for my part and for my people, may I say plainly that we regard the struggle for freedom as an unending, constant, unrelenting demand upon us, that with all our acknowledged failings, faults, and weaknesses, we are seeking to build in our land a society in which the freedom of our Republic will truly become the freedom of every one of its citizens.

Finally, in this world of contending great powers, the independence of the small or weak nation is at best a precarious and fragile thing. Obviously, the ultimate greater freedom will lie in a greater coherence, a uniting of regional interests, in the creation of counterbalancing moral, economic, and physical strength, in the greatest possible common action by all to avert the disaster of a new world war. Let us face squarely up to the fact that within the Nation we can regain our self-respect and grapple with our local problems but that for the primary goals of economic transformation and well-being and peace, the Nation no longer suffices. Western European man today is paying the terrible price for preserving too long the narrow and inadequate instrument of the nation state. We of Asia and Africa are emerging into this world as new nation states in an epoch when nationalism, as such, can solve only the least of our problems and leaves us powerless to meet the more serious ones. We have to try to avoid repeating all of Europe's historic errors. We have to have the imagination and courage to put ourselves in the forefront of the attempt to create a 20th-century world based on the true interdependence of peoples.

I have said that besides the issues of colonialism and political freedom, all of us here are concerned with the matter of racial equality. This is a touchstone, I think, for most of us assembled here and the peoples we represent. The systems and the manners of it have varied, but there has not been and there is not a Western colonial regime, which has not imposed, to a greater or lesser degree, on the people it ruled, the doctrine of their own racial inferiority. We have known, and some of us still know, the searing experience of being demeaned in our own lands, of being systematically relegated to subject status not only politically and economically, and militarily—but racially as well. Here was a stigma that could be applied to rich and poor alike, to prince and slave, boss man and workingman, landlord and peasant, scholar and ignoramus. To bolster his rule, to justify his own power to himself, Western white man assumed that his superiority lay in his very genes, in the color of his skin. This made the lowliest drunken sot superior, in colonial society, to the highest product of culture and scholarship and industry among the subject people.

I do not think in this company I have to labor the full import of this pernicious doctrine and practice. I do not think I have to try to measure the role played by this

racism as a driving force in the development of the nationalist movements in our many lands. For many it has made the goal of regaining a status of simple manhood the be-all and end-all of a lifetime of devoted struggle and sacrifice.

Today this type of Western racism survives in virulent form only in certain parts of Africa, notably in the Union of South Africa, but certainly in many other places as well on that vast continent. Against this every decent man on earth has to set his face. In the United Nations the Asian and African states have again and again forced this issue on the unwilling attention of the other members. There we could see palpably the extent to which Western men have had to become defensive about their past racist attitudes. Few of the Western countries were willing to go far enough in condemning the racial practices of the Government of the Union of South Africa. They have yet to learn, it seems, how deeply this issue cuts and how profoundly it unites non-Western peoples who may disagree on all sorts of questions. Again, we can only hope that this Conference serves as a sober and yet jolting reminder to them that the day of Western racism is passing along with the day of Western power over non-Western peoples. Its survival in any form can only hang like an albatross around the necks of those many people in the West who sincerely seek to build a freer and better world.

No less than this can be said. But there is something more, too. It is one of our heaviest responsibilities, we of Asia and Africa, not to fall ourselves into the racist trap. We will do this if we let ourselves be drawn insensibly—or deliberately—into any kind of counterracism, if we respond to the white man's prejudice against us as nonwhites with prejudice against whites simply because they are white. What a triumph this would be for racism if it should come about. How completely we would defeat ourselves and all who have ever struggled in our countries to be free. There is no more dangerous or immoral or absurd idea than the idea of any kind of policy or grouping based on color or race as such. This would, in the deepest sense, mean giving up all hope of human freedom in our time. I think that over the generations the deepest source of our own confidence in ourselves had to come from the deeply rooted knowledge that the white man was wrong; that in proclaiming the superiority of his race, qua race, he stamped himself with his own weakness and confirmed all the rest of us in our dogged conviction that we could and would reassert ourselves as men.

Our quarrel with racism is that it substitutes the accident of skin color for judgment of men as men. Counterracism would have us do the same; to lump white men by their supposed racial grouping and govern our acts and reactions accordingly. It is our task to rise above this noxious nonsense. We have the responsibility to remain aware that this kind of racist attitude has been the practice, not of all white men but only of some, that it flies in the face of their own profoundest religious beliefs and political goals and aspirations, that in almost all Western lands, and especially in the United States, the internal struggle against racism and all its manifestations has been going on steadily and victoriously.

We have the responsibility to acknowledge more than this; this business of racism, or other things like it, is an outcropping of one of many human weaknesses that we all share. The racism of Western white man has played an especially prominent role in history because the Western man associated it with the establishment of his great power over so many non-Western peoples. As such, it deserves the special and prominent place it must have in the thinking and feeling of everyone. But we must also soberly ask our-

selves: Is there a single society or culture represented in this Conference which does not in some degree have its counterpart of this kind of prejudice and ignorance? Where is the society in which men have not in some manner divided themselves for political, social, and economic purposes, by wholly irrational and indefensible categories of status, birth, and yes, even skin color? It was a major part of the greatness of India's immortal leader Mahatma Gandhi, that he devoted so much of his fruitful life of selflessness and sacrifice to a struggle against precisely this kind of thing in Indian life. Would that we all gave as much time to the mote in our own eye as we give to denouncing the beam in the eye of another.

Surely we are entitled to our resentment and rejection of white racism wherever it exists. But we are also called upon, as honest men who want to better man's estate wherever and whatever he is, to acknowledge that in degree we all suffer from the same sin of ignorance and immorality. I ask you to remember that just as Western political thought has given us all so many of our basic ideas of political freedom, justice, and equity, it is Western science which in this generation has exploded the mythology of race. Let us not preserve stupid racial superstitions which belong to the past. Let us work to remove this ugly disease wherever it is rooted, whether it be among Western men or among ourselves.

Lastly, I have said that all of us here are concerned with peaceful economic growth. This brings us closest of all to the hub, the center, the heart of our common preoccupations, because the political forms and methods we seek and choose, the social ideas and ideals we embrace, are all wrapped up in the way in which we strive for growth. Economic growth, economic change, transformation of our backward and inadequate economies—these we all seek. These we must seek, else we stagnate and die. After all, it is precisely because the billion and a half people of Asia and Africa have begun in our time to strive for a better economic stake in life that most of us are here today. This is the great new overwhelming fact of this century. The way in which this is achieved will fix the shape of history for all future men.

We all confront the staggering facts of our economic backwardness. This has been partly due to factors of climate, geography, and the stubborn survival of obsolete social patterns. But it has also in large measure and perhaps decisively been the result of patterns imposed upon us by Western colonialism. This heritage is the heaviest burden we carry with us into the new epoch of national freedom. The great masses of our people live in a state of rural poverty. We need to diversify our economies. We need to industrialize in accordance with our resources and needs. We have to win a more balanced place in the market places of the world. We have to do this in a manner that will effectively raise the standard of living of our people. These are the things we have fought for. These are the things that some of us here are still fighting for. For these things above all, we have needed to be free to seek our own way.

But let us not have too many illusions about national independence. We arrive in the world as nations in the middle of the 20th century, not the 19th or the 18th. We have to strive to become nations in a time when history has already passed from the nation to larger units of economic and social coherence: the region, the continent, the world. It is a world as envisioned by Rabindranath Tagore, "not divided into fragments by narrow domestic walls . . ." The idea of national self-sufficiency served the Western World only for a short time as a means to effective growth. Indeed, the great travail of the Western World, its conflicts, rivalries, and wars have derived in



no small degree from the fact that the nation, as such, has outlived its usefulness as an instrument of progress. Not even the great powers of today can stand alone, much less newly emergent states weak in everything but the will to grow. In this 20th century world the sober fact is that a purely national economy is an illusion. We cannot start where, say, England started two centuries ago. We have to make our places in a world that has already made tremendous advances technologically and where economic interdependence has become the key to effective economic development and growth.

Considering the present state of the world, with its profound conflicts and insecurities, this may be viewed by some as a crippling disadvantage. But in a very real sense, and a more hopeful sense, it is rather an advantage if we can but grasp it. It means that we need not go through the equivalent of the decades and centuries of ugly, painful, and costly development which occurred in most Western countries. It means that if circumstances favor it, we can make use of the most ultramodern technologies to transform ourselves more rapidly, to make new and hitherto unforeseen use of our resources. Who knows yet what the new potentialities of nuclear power are going to mean for Asia and Africa? It is obvious that the real world we live in does not at this moment offer much promise of any early opportunity to find out. But here we have one of the real stakes we all share in preserving the peace, in creating international instruments which will put men to work for man's growth instead of his destruction.

Our fate is bound up with the fate of the whole world. National isolation, in any real sense, is an impossibility in our time, whether we think of an ideal world uniting its human and natural resources for the well-being of all, or the real world, deeply divided and groping its way to decisions that will in one way or another affect every person on earth. The fact is that we will need greater world coherence than we have now if we are to thrive. The fact is that the effective mobilization of world capital and resources will be absolutely vital to us in the process of mobilizing our own capital and our own resources. The fact is that these things will depend in great measure on the further course of the conflicts that now govern all world affairs. It is pure illusion to think that we can be independent of these big facts.

But this by no means leaves us helpless to act in our own interest. It does not mean that we have no choice but to leave the great decisions to others. Quite the contrary. Quite the contrary, because it is precisely in our lands, in our continents, that the most important decisions are going to be made. And it is we who will make them, by what we do or by what we do not do in the coming years.

It could be that Russia's bombs or America's bombs will determine the future shape of the world and the fate of humanity. If it comes to that the tragedy will be total: it will make all we say or do here or anywhere else quite irrelevant. Reason will die and the survivors will move as best they can into a new epoch of savagery. But I do not think the great decisions will come that way. I think the shape of the world is going to be determined in large measure by the way in which the peoples of Asia and Africa go about the business of transforming their lives and their societies.

What do we want? How do we propose to seek it? These are the questions on which the fate of the world really turns. In not fully understanding this, many in the Western World commit their most tragic blunder. For our part, we of Asia and Africa have to face up squarely to the big choices that lie before us. We have to try to understand as clearly as we can exactly what they mean.

There are certain things in all our minds on this matter. We all want to the best of our power and wisdom to seek change in terms of the genius of our own various cultures and histories. We all want no more foreign exploitation of our wealth for the benefit of foreign interests. We do not want our future development to turn out to be another alien graft on our lives. We want this development to raise the physical and educational standards of our peoples. What roads lead to these ends? How do we begin to face up to these vast and formidable tasks?

There is no magic wand or automatic formula to bring about social and economic change. It means that we have to assume our own heavy responsibilities. It means mobilizing people, mobilizing resources. It means great toil, flexibility, adaptability, intelligence. But it also means defining our goal. Is our goal just so many new industries or factories, new dams or bridges or transportation systems? Or is our goal the betterment and the greater freedom, through these and other things, of the lives of the people?

This is no simple rhetorical question. Wrapped up in it are all the troubled issues of our time. And because according to the joint communique of the Bogor Conference "the basic purpose of this Conference is that the countries concerned should become better acquainted with one another's point of view," may I outline for you our views on the possible choices open to us.

There is one road to change which some countries have adopted and which offer itself to the rest of us as a possible choice. This is the road which proposes total change through total power, through avowed dictatorship and the forcible manipulation of men and means to achieve certain ends, the rigid control of all thought and expression, the ruthless suppression of all opposition, the pervasive control of human life in all spheres by a single, tightly run, self-selected organization of elite individuals. I know that an elaborate series of phrases and rationalization are often used to describe this system. But I am concerned not with propaganda myths. I am concerned with realities. I think we all have to be concerned with what this system offers and what it means.

Does the road to greater freedom really lie through an indefinite period of less freedom? Is it for this that we have in this generation raised our heads and taken up the struggle against foreign tyrannies?

Has all the sacrifice, struggle, and devotion, all been, then, for the purpose of replacing foreign tyranny by domestic tyranny?

Do we fight to regain our manhood from Western colonial rulers only to surrender it to rulers among ourselves who seize the power to keep us enslaved?

Is it true, can it be true, in this vastly developed 20th century, that national progress must be paid for with the individual well-being and freedom of millions of people? Can we really believe that this price will, in some dim and undefined future time, be redeemed by the well-being and freedom of the yet unborn?

The philosophers of this system have answered this question through their doctrine of the so-called withering away of the state. But the rulers who have established their power in real life and not in the realm of bookish dreams have abandoned this tenet of their faith. We have had ample opportunity to witness over more than a generation now that this kind of power, once established, roots itself more and more deeply, gets more and more committed to perpetuating itself. Moreover, and the whole logic of human experience throws its weight into the scale, this system of power becomes inherently expansionist. It cannot accept the premise of peace with opponents

outside its borders any more than it can make peace with opponents inside its borders. It seeks and must seek to crush all opposition, wherever it exists.

This road is open before many of us. The gateway to it is strewn with sweet-smelling garlands of phrases and promises and high sentiment. But once you march through it, the gate clangs behind you. The policeman becomes master and your duty thereafter is forever to say aye. Even those who enjoy the role of mastery must know that this system devours its own.

No, my friends, I don't think we have come to where we are, only to surrender blindly to a new superbarbarism, a new superimperialism, a new superpower. We do not want leaderships in our countries subservient to foreign rulers, be they in London or Paris, The Hague, or Washington, or, we must add, Moscow. I think our peoples want to worship the Almighty and live in accordance with His laws, to better their lot, to educate themselves and their children, raise themselves from the degradation of want and disease and misery, by holding up their own heads and acting freely to achieve these great and difficult aims by their own free means in partnership with similarly dedicated people everywhere in the world.

That is the freedom of the democratic way of life. That is the freedom we want all the peoples of Asia and Africa to enjoy. That is the freedom that President Ramon Magsaysay of the Philippines had in mind when he authored the Pacific Charter which enshrines the dignity of man, his well-being, his security, his progress, his nation's right to self-determination. The Philippine delegation is here not only to reiterate the ideals of that charter but to underscore in this conference that it is the sense of the Filipino people that such right of self-determination includes the right of nations to decide exclusively by themselves their ability to assume the responsibilities inherent in an independent political status. This is the time for Asia and Africa to reassert this principle and serve notice to the world that only by its unqualified acceptance by everyone can there be peace and justice for all mankind.

The success of this Conference will be measured not only by what we do for ourselves but also by what we do for the entire human community. Large as is the cause of Asia, there is a cause even larger. It is the cause of the human family in a world struggling to liberate itself from the chaos of international anarchy. In short, our cause is the cause of man. If the voice coming out of this Conference speaks for Asia and Africa alone, the words will have energy and force but they will make no claim on history. But if our voice speaks for man—man as world citizen rather than world warrior—then we can return to our peoples with the knowledge that we have served them as they need most to be served.

Fellow delegates, our strength flows not out of our number though the numbers we represent are great. It flows out of our perception of history and out of vital purpose for tomorrow. If that purpose is stained by resentment or desire for revenge then this Conference will be a fragile and forgetful thing. Let us, therefore, draw strength not from the hurts of past or present but from our common hopes—hopes that can come to life in all peoples everywhere. And if the test of that strength should be our ability to forgive, then let it be said that we were the giants of our time.

Let us invoke the blessing and the guidance of Almighty God over our deliberations so that this Conference may prove to be the radiating center of the divine injunction "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" and we may help to make the East and West live together as enjoined by our ancient Asian creed, "We are all brothers under the canopy of heaven."

## We Question George Humphrey's Judgment

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following text of a splendid speech made by our colleague, the Honorable EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, at the annual Jefferson-Jackson dinner of the Young Democratic Club of York, Pa., on Saturday evening, April 23:

ECONOMIC PHILOSOPHY AND TAX POLICIES OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY GEORGE HUMPHREY

(By EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Member of Congress)

It is difficult to find or establish a frame of reference for criticism of the present administration. Even before President Eisenhower was elected, it was stated by one of his chief supporters, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, that we should not expect him to have a clear stand on issues but anticipate that he would act on the basis of subconscious principles. We have since been assured that his appointments—Cabinet positions and others—are men of good will. If one questions program or policy, he is readily accused of questioning the integrity and the good intentions of these governmental officials. Mistakes do occur. Republican defenders say the President is not responsible because he was not informed. It was contended in a Washington newspaper recently that the "kitchen cabinet" should be held responsible. Apparently having excused the President, the current move is to excuse the Cabinet and to lay responsibility, if it is necessary to do so, on the third level of officials in the present administration.

I do not tonight intend to criticize the President, nor the third-level Government officials, nor even those in the second or Cabinet level who are not considered strong men or important influences on Government. I would like, however, to take up with you the record and the policies of Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey, who is generally accepted as being the strongest man in the Eisenhower Cabinet. The story of his appointment as the Secretary of the Treasury has, insofar as I know, never been fully reported. Politically he called himself a Taft man before the 1952 convention. He is reported to have worked in some manner, although there is no extensive public record, for the election of President Eisenhower. Again according to a report, he was appointed Secretary of the Treasury on the recommendation of Gen. Lucius Clay. Whatever his background and whoever his supporters were, George Humphrey seemed quite ready to assume the duties of the Secretary of the Treasury. Apparently he almost immediately impressed President Eisenhower, who said, shortly after he took office, that "In Cabinet meetings I always wait for George Humphrey to speak. I sit back and listen to the others talk while he doesn't say anything. But I know that when he speaks up he will say just what I am thinking." If this is actually the case, it would seem quite unnecessary for George Humphrey to speak at all to the President unless the President preferred to have Humphrey tell the other Cabinet members what he, the President, was thinking rather than tell them himself.

The Secretary of the Treasury, as a man responsible largely for fiscal and economic policy of the United States, had when he took office, I assume, some sense of responsibility with regard to statements made by

Republicans in the course of the 1952 campaign. There were, of course, the regular, expected denunciations of taxes in general, promises of tax reduction, of balancing the budget, and reducing the national debt. Some Republicans spoke of imposing a 25-percent limitation on personal income taxes, charging that the graduated scale as it existed in the law was immoral. There were many Republicans who denounced the corporate profits tax and others who said that the excise taxes were iniquitous. They expressed general dissatisfaction with what their candidate called treadmill prosperity and spoke of stabilizing and at the same time expanding our economy. The Republican platform promised to "aid small business in every practicable way." "The Republican Party will create," the platform said, "conditions providing for farm prosperity and stability safeguarding the farmers independence and opening opportunities for young people in rural communities." These in general were the promises and the program with regard to Government finance and the American economy.

Let us look now to the performance. In the first 3 years of the present administration, there has been a budget deficit each year, and it is estimated that the deficit for fiscal 1956 will be approximately \$2½ billion. If this estimate is correct, the 4-year Republican administration will show an increase in the national debt from approximately \$259 billion at the end of fiscal 1952, to approximately \$276 billion at the end of fiscal 1956—an increase of approximately \$17 billion. The Republicans have attempted to distinguish between good and bad deficits—the standard being for the most part that a deficit occurring under a Democratic administration is a bad deficit, whereas one occurring under a Republican administration is a good deficit. A sharper distinction has been made by one observer who states the difference in these terms: That the Democrats spend more than they collect, whereas the Republicans collect less than they spend. Promises to give the country something other than treadmill prosperity have been partially fulfilled, but in a negative way. The gross national product declined by approximately \$7½ billion in 1954. Talk of 100 percent of parity for farmers in the market place does not stand up well in view of the present parity ratio of approximately 86. The fact that farm income is generally down and that the number of people living on farms is declining does not square very well with the Republican platform statement that it would create conditions providing for farm prosperity and stability and that it would open opportunities for young people in rural communities. The rate of small business failures has increased.

Of course the Secretary of the Treasury is not entirely responsible for these developments any more than he would be entirely responsible if the level of prosperity had increased, if farm income were high, if unemployment were reduced. There are limits to what Government can do in the way of directing the American economy and fortunately, also, as result of the passage of legislation such as the social security program, the farm program, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, and similar legislation, limitations were placed upon the disastrous effects which the operation of an entirely free economy and unrestrained competition might have upon the domestic economy of the United States. Nonetheless, Government policy, particularly fiscal policy, does have an important bearing upon the economic welfare of the Nation.

Let us look at the record of the administration. Shortly after being established in the position of authority, the Secretary of the Treasury initiated what was called a hard-money policy. This hard-money policy essentially involved an increase in interest rates so that those who had to borrow money would be required to pay more to

those persons and institutions who were lending it. The tight-money policy has since been reversed or at least modified. The experiment, however, was expensive. For example, on one long-term Government bond issue, the Secretary of the Treasury set an interest of 3¼ percent, which was 30 percent higher than the previous rate of 2½ percent. This issue was extremely popular. It was oversubscribed by five times. The taxpayers of the country will pay in added interest on this bond issue alone over the life period of the bonds approximately \$200 million. Interest rates on other Government securities were also increased and the increased interest rate spread throughout the entire economy. Although the administration has had to retreat from its extreme position on interest rates, its general policy has been one of tightening the money market and increasing the cost of money to borrowers. There is evidence that the economy is recovering now, but, I think, there is no question but what it was staggered and seriously hurt by the hard-money policy.

In the field of taxation, the attitude of the administration, or at least of the Secretary of the Treasury, is becoming clear. There has been, of course, no general attack upon all taxation, as was indicated there might be in the campaign. The direction of the administration's tax policy is indicated in the administration's support of two major tax changes. First, in its support of the dividend exemption provision in the 1954 tax law, and in its more recent opposition to the \$20 income-tax credit proposed in the 84th Congress. The administration argued for the dividend exemption on the grounds that this would eliminate double taxation. It is significant to note, however, that at the same time the administration was asking for an extension of the regular corporate profits tax. I think it fair to ask the question as to why, if the administration was concerned about double taxation, it did not simply recommend that the corporate profits be reduced and the complicated provisions with regard to dividend exemptions not be injected into the tax program. This would have been the simple way to eliminate so-called double taxation. As a matter of fact, however, the corporate profits tax is to a large extent a regressive tax which falls upon the purchaser of the corporation's products or services—to a large extent, therefore, in the nature of a sales tax. Dividend exemption, however, gives tax advantage and tax relief to those who receive an income from investment. Seventy-six cents out of every dividend dollar are paid to the top 4 taxpayers out of every 100 taxpayers.

The Republican administration, led by the Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, was successful in defeating the \$20 income tax credit proposed by the Democratic majority of the House of Representatives in this session of Congress. The argument of the administration was that the condition of the Federal budget did not justify a reduction in taxes. The Secretary of the Treasury argued that this consideration was the primary one and that in view of the budget deficit the tax rates should not be reduced. It is interesting to note, however, that when the Republican tax reduction bill was under consideration in the 83d Congress, the administration in the face of a budget deficit of approximately \$4½ billion supported a bill which was expected to reduce revenue by approximately \$1½ billion. They then argued that revenue was not the important consideration, but that the economic effects of taxes were to be given primary consideration. Approximately 1 year later in anticipation of a deficit of \$2.5 billion, the administration opposed as unsound a reduction of approximately \$815 million in tax revenue arguing that economic considerations were of secondary importance.

On the basis of this record, I think that the following conclusion can safely be made. First, that one can expect no consistency in



the arguments of the administration on tax or economic questions. Second, that the administration is not as strongly opposed to the corporate profits tax as it has sometimes indicated, but is rather concerned about reducing taxes paid by people in the high income bracket, especially when that revenue is derived from investment in corporations. Third, that it is not as anxious as it claimed to be during the 1952 campaign to reduce excise taxes, although there has been little indication of late that the Secretary of the Treasury intends to press for consideration of a national sales tax. Their policy is not one of killing the goose that lays the golden eggs, but rather one of overfeeding the goose.

Actually we should not be altogether surprised at the policies which have been adopted and supported by the administration. Examination of the statements of the Secretary of the Treasury indicate that he has acted about as we should have expected him to act and as we may expect him to act in the future. We should not, for example, be surprised that business failures in the \$5,000 to \$25,000 class increased by approximately 70 percent between 1953 and 1954. We should not be surprised to learn that the administration is inclined to favor in its defense contracts the larger corporations, for the Secretary of the Treasury has said that "America needs big business, it requires big businesses, big enterprises, to do the things in big ways that a big country has to have." I think that we would all agree that America does need big business, but that it also needs small business and businesses of medium size. We should not be altogether surprised that the administration's tax policies particularly have tended to favor investors, for the Secretary of the Treasury, testifying before the Senate Committee on Finance in 1954, said, "There is nothing more important for the future of America than to encourage widespread investment in American business." All of us would agree, of course, that investment in American business is important, but I am sure that few would say that there is nothing more important than such investment. We cannot, for example, sacrifice necessary provisions for defense in order to encourage American business. We cannot neglect our international problems in the interest of stimulating such investment. Nor can we sacrifice any large number of our own people to poverty or to unemployment in the interest of investment in business. What we have reflected in the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury is at best an acceptance of the trickle-down theory, and more obviously an acceptance of the old fallacy of accepting the primacy of economics over every other consideration. It leads one to believe that President Wilson was right when he said that the Republicans thought that the only persons who could be trusted with the prosperity and welfare of the Nation were those who had the greatest material stake in it.

In view of this emphasis on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury and the acceptance of his judgments by the President, we should not be surprised to learn, as we could from a recent report of the U. S. News & World Report, that during the time covered by its survey the President had invited 294 businessmen to his dinners but during the same period, only 9 farmers. That while he had invited 294 businessmen, he had invited 8 labor union officials; 294 businessmen, but 6 church leaders; 294 businessmen, but only 30 educators.

We should not be too surprised at what the Secretary of the Treasury recommends with regard to taxes, since he stated to the Ways and Means Committee of the House that the only purpose which the Ways and Means Committee was to take into consideration in connection with tax programs was that of raising revenue. He said that ques-

tions of social reform, or social well-being, should not be considered in relation to tax policy. I suppose that had he been hard pressed, he would not have recommended, at least publicly, that taxes should be imposed so heavily upon low-income groups that they could not adequately support their families, but such a conclusion is certainly inherent in the tax policy which he announced to the committee.

The political and economic philosophy is perhaps best summarized in his statement: "We must remember the fundamental principle that the best government is the least government." If this principle, as he calls it, were accepted and carried to its logical conclusion, one would be an anarchist advocating no government at all. This statement of Humphrey does not express any kind of fundamental principle, but rather a fundamental misunderstanding of the function of government. The best government is the government which is adequate to the needs of the people and which performs those functions which government should perform. The function of laws in government and governmental institutions is to protect people from force and violence by those who are more powerful either in terms of physical, or economic power, or whatever other power they may possess; and on the positive side to promote as the preamble to our Constitution says, "the general welfare." In the period in which government was weak in this country, we had exploitation in the economic field by powerful forces—exploitation of men through unjust and depressed wages and inhuman working conditions; exploitation of consumers and of competitors; and exploitation, also, of our natural resources. It was the policy of those who were interested in such exploitation to keep government weak, because they were then relatively strong. The history of the United States shows that through government the people of the country have come to exercise some measure of control over these forces, and through government action to secure some measure of justice for all of our citizens. Of course, if government were weakened, the economic institutions and forces in which the Secretary of the Treasury is interested could operate with greater freedom and independence and so could use their power without intervention, or without opposition by government.

We need not question his integrity, nor his good intentions, but certainly we can question his judgment. If what he has said indicates what he really thinks, and if he intends to carry through to logical conclusions the potential of his political philosophy, then we have genuine cause to be concerned and to be alarmed, and, as active members of the Democratic Party, to intensify our efforts to continue control not only of the Congress of the United States, but also of the executive branch of the Government; not with the intention of using that power and control to advance our personal interests or the limited interests of the Democratic Party, but with the purpose in mind of controlling government and using it so that the best interests of the people of the United States may be served by the Government.

### Persecution of the Church in Poland

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the 8th day of May constitutes the second

anniversary of the issuance of the last official protest of the Catholic clergy in Poland against persecution of the church by the state Communist authorities. Severe repression has made subsequent effective protests impossible.

In view of the continued persecution of the Catholic Church in Poland, and in other countries behind the Iron Curtain, contrary to all human laws, and to international law, it is timely today to recall this memorable occasion.

On May 8, 1953, the last assembly of the Polish bishops was held in Krakow. The occasion was the 700th anniversary of the canonization of St. Stanislaw Szczepanowski, bishop of Krakow and patron of Poland. The Polish episcopate then assembled in Krakow, sent to Boleslaw Bierut, chairman of the State Council in Warsaw, a lengthy document presenting the situation of the church and religious life in Poland from 1950 to 1953 under Communist domination.

The document, an example of a great moderation, of a deep understanding of the apostolic mission of the church and of great love for the Polish nation, does not enter into any polemics, but states and lists "before God and history" the wrongs which Marxism has been doing to the Catholic Church and the Polish nation, trying to deprive it of its thousand-year-old Christian tradition and attempting to destroy in Poland the faith of the people in God.

This memorial has become the last great document of the Polish episcopate containing the signature of the Primate Cardinal Stephen Wyszyński. From that time it was impossible to hold another assembly of the Polish episcopate and from that time on the bishops were prevented from presenting any further documents on religious life in Poland and on the fate of the church there. Five months thereafter Cardinal Wyszyński, the head of the church in Poland, was placed under arrest and has not been heard from since.

At the very beginning of the document, the bishops state: "In accordance with truth, the Polish episcopate feels it is its duty to state that the situation of the church in Poland is not only not improving but, on the contrary, is steadily deteriorating. The responsibility toward God, the community and history demands that at least the more menacing negative aspects be named without covering them up, and defined accurately." After this preamble the bishops gave a list of wrongs which the Communist regime had committed during the past 3 years against the church in Poland. Among these wrongs the episcopate enumerates the "removal of religion from the schools and of God from the hearts of the youth," "political pressure and attempts of diversion among the clergy," "absolute destruction of the Catholic press and periodicals," "intrusion in church affairs and attempts at hindering Apostolic activities of the church," "unusual hard fate of the church in western territories."

Each of these charges was supported by substantial evidence. Furthermore, the episcopate emphasized "attempts and efforts of the episcopate in creating mutual relations."

The document was ended by a solemn declaration of the bishops of the following conditions:

#### POLISH BISHOPS' DECLARATION

Feeling that it is their highest duty, the Polish episcopate points herewith to the tragic fate of the church in Poland, to the symptoms of the oppression and its causes, and the sources from which flows the concern, the anxiety, and the exasperation of the broad masses of the Catholic community.

We see the basic and main cause of this state of affairs in the hatred which destroys the strength of our country and seems to forebode sinister wrangles. We are acting not with any controversial aims in mind, but only to emphasize the burning necessity of finding an honest and fair way out of the existing situation. We are seeking a positive solution, which would be beneficial both to the church and the state. Nothing is further from us than to destroy the unity, to introduce dissension, or spread hatred. So this time again we do not refuse to reach an agreement, we do not forsake the will for a peaceful solution and collaboration in the important task of a successful settlement of relations between church and state in accordance with the agreement reached on April 14, 1950. However, in the present state of affairs it depends solely on the sincere and good will of the government whether internal peace and reciprocal harmony which are so essential, will be really achieved. It depends on whether the government will forsake its radical, destructive hate toward Catholicism, whether it will abandon its aim of subjugating the church and turning it into an instrument of the state.

We wish that the government should clearly understand what the decree about the filling of church positions really means for the structure of the church. We therefore remind that by this act, which is illegal according to the constitution, the state has usurped for itself the right to a constant intrusion in the internal affairs of the church, sometimes pertaining to the conscience of the priests, and to a willful and systematic subjection of church jurisdiction to its own will.

This is inadmissible from the point of view of the church. First because the jurisdiction of the church pertains to strictly religious, internal and supernatural matters, such as teaching God's revelation, the teaching of Christian morals, the administration of the Holy Sacraments, the organization of religious services, the spiritual guidance of the souls and the consciences of the people.

In the name of what rights could the authority over such strictly religious matters be submitted to the authority of the state, which by its nature pertains to matters which are exclusively secular and temporal? Particularly, if that authority is based upon a materialistic and anti-religious ideology, and is filled with destructive hatred toward the church? Every person, even an atheist, should understand that such a dependence is quite impossible. Therefore Lenin justly condemned the subjugation of the church to the state as a "cursed and disgraceful" thing. This is moreover, an impossible thing for the church because, in accordance with its unalterable constitution, with regard to which even the Pope is helpless, there is not and cannot be in that Catholic community another jurisdictional authority except the one which flows from above, from the Pope and the Bishops.

Therefore, whenever the secular authority willfully tries to grasp the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, in order to make it dependent, it usurps something which does not belong to it, and violates not only the rights of the church, but also the divine law. On what basis therefore could the government require of the Polish episcopate to accept a fact which is so glaringly inconsistent with the

structure of the church and its rights, and which even violates the sacred divine laws.

Shortly after the announcement of the decree about filling the church positions, representatives of the episcopate deemed it their duty to make a formal protest in that matter. Today, the whole Polish episcopate protests.

We declare, aware of our apostolic mission, in a most solemn and categorical manner, that we cannot consider as legal and binding this decree, because it is inconsistent with the constitution of the Polish People's Republic, and violates the laws of God and of the church. "One should obey God rather than men."

We do not refuse to take into consideration the motives and the suggestions of the government. But in filling church positions we must be directed by divine and by ecclesiastical law, and we must appoint only those priests whom we consider, in our conscience, as fit and worthy. We find it difficult to hide how little worthy of those positions, especially the more important ones, are those, who yielded to external political pressure and allowed themselves to be used as instruments of diversion in the church. Those priests give very slight guaranty that, as representatives of the church, they will defend with devotion and firmness the essential and divine principles and rights of the church.

If it should happen that external factors will make it impossible for us to appoint competent and proper people to ecclesiastical positions, we are decided to leave them vacant rather than to place the spiritual rule of souls in the hands of unworthy individuals. And if someone should dare to accept any ecclesiastical position from outside (the church) let him know, that by the same fact he falls under the heavy punishment of excommunication.

Similarly, if we are placed before the alternative: either to subject ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the state making it an instrument of the latter, or to bear a personal sacrifice, we will not hesitate, we will follow the voice of our apostolic vocation and our conscience as priests, with peace of mind and the knowledge that we have not given the slightest reason for persecution, that suffering becomes our lot for no other reason than the cause of Christ and His church.

We are not allowed to place the things belonging to God on the altar of Caesar. *Non possumus.*

We respect the personal opinions of all people, also those of our present adversaries, whom we as Christians are not permitted to hate—but we demand the same respect for the religious opinions of Catholic Poles, especially children and the youth.

We respect the duties toward the nation and the state, and often remind our faithful about them, but at the same time we demand that no obstacles be placed in the way of Catholics for the performing of their duties toward God and the church. We are conscious of the special tasks and duties of the Catholic priest toward his country, and that is why we often reminded our priests about them, requesting their solicitude for the development and welfare of our country. But we also demand with emphasis that our priests should not be torn away from their religious duties, that they should not be drawn into political affairs which are alien to their vocation, that political pressure aimed at using them as instruments in the struggle of the state against the church be stopped, that they should not be forced to break their oath by which they pledged loyalty to the church and their bishops.

In short, in accordance with the principle of separation of church and state, as guaranteed in our constitution, the state must abstain from interfering in the religious, spiritual, and internal affairs of the church.

In the name of the welfare of our nation, we have the right to demand from the lead-

ers of the Marxist camp a revision of the principles of ruthless hatred and ostracism toward our religion, the church and God. The Polish episcopate demands from the council of ministers that, in accordance with article 32.7 of the constitution of the Polish Peoples Republic, it undertake the defense of the rights of Catholics in the Polish Peoples Republic.

This memorable episcopate letter of May 8, 1953, can be well described as an important historical document in the war against God, religion, and the church in Poland conducted by the Communist regime.

The history of this war with God and religion in a previous period, from 1945 to 1950, is described by another Polish episcopate letter dated September 12, 1950. It was signed by Cardinal Adam Stefan Sapieha and by the Polish Primate Cardinal Wyszyński. It was unanimously adopted by all the Polish bishops assembled in Czestochowa and forwarded to President Boleslaw Bierut. In it the following was said:

In the history of the Catholic Church in Poland the last 5 years (1945-50) have been marked by unprecedented oppression. Unilateral withdrawal of the concordat by the Polish state; failure of the state to give recognition to the church organizations in western occupied lands; the failure to permit renewal of Catholic organizational activities; gradual but steady liquidation of Catholic schools; unusually strong limitations on religious press and religious publications by censorship and limitations so that they have almost ceased to exist; depriving the church of diocesan publications; taking over by the state of social organizations and hospitals belonging to the church; barring of organization church life and compulsive registration of cloisters; limitation on the public freedom of religious cults and limitations of the right to conduct Mass and religious practices, such as missions, public processions, religious gatherings and congresses; the liquidation of the church welfare organization Caritas; nationalization of church properties; the press campaign against the episcopate; the limitation of religious practices in schools; removal from the schools of hundreds of religious text books; support of youth organizations with ideology inimical to Christianity; support of publications discrediting historically the accomplishments of the church in the field of science and national life; antireligious propaganda conducted by the press, by lectures, and by thousands of publications; limitations on the freedom of conscience of members of organizations, parties, and trade unions; antireligious propaganda in kindergartens and schools, summer camps, and in youth camps; the use of the whole administrative apparatus, the courts, police authorities, and tax offices to exert pressure on the conscience of the citizenry and of the priests and bishops. All this is only a partial list and does not give a picture of the whole truth of the situation of the Catholic Church after 5 years (1945-50). Having this in mind the episcopate has, on many occasions, presented its complaints and protests to you, Mr. President and chairman of the committee of ministers. Unfortunately, it was without results. The last year, 1949-50, particularly after the concordat of April 14, 1950, was marked by a hastening of the tempo of the liquidation of the church's social institutions and activities.

This document of September 12, 1950, together with that of the Polish episcopate of May 8, 1953, gives a true picture of the religious persecution in Poland on the part of the Communist regime in the



period from 1945 to 1953. They present a picture of the brutal war with God, religion, and the church conducted by the Communists in Poland.

With the arrest of the Polish Primate Cardinal Stephan Wyszyński on September 26, 1953, and his imprisonment by the Communists, an end came to the period in which the Polish episcopate could present this type of memorial, which is now a historical document, to the Warsaw regime. Since that time it is unknown where the Polish primate is imprisoned, what his condition of health is, and under what circumstances he is living. Despite the fact that it has been requested from all parts of the world, the Communist regime has to this day given no official information regarding him.

The high moral position which Cardinal Wyszyński has gained in the Catholic world is best attested to by the greeting sent by the American cardinals and bishops to Cardinal Wyszyński through the Voice of America during the last Christmas holidays. Cardinals Spellman, Stritch, Mooney, and McIntyre joined in the greetings, as did also a number of American bishops such as O'Boyle, Alter, Donahue, Keough, Lucey, Byrne, Gannon, Russell, Meyer, O'Hara, Cushing, Wosnicki, Kroll, and many other high dignitaries of the Catholic Church in the United States. They all emphasized the fact that in Cardinal Wyszyński, the primate of Poland, they see "a symbol of courage which every man should display in defense of freedom."

The Communist attack on the Polish Primate Cardinal Wyszyński opened a new period of religious persecution in Poland. The war with God, religion, and the church took on a new form, but it never stopped or slackened.

After nearly 2 years the Polish bishops and the Polish episcopate are Communist prisoners of the Warsaw regime. Deprived of its leader, the Polish Primate Cardinal Wyszyński, there have been no plenary assemblies of the Polish episcopate for nearly 2 years. After 2 years the episcopate has been compelled by the Communist regime to be silent. The bishops have very rarely been able to be heard, and then only on strictly religious matters and on subjects in which they are compelled to speak by the Communists.

On the other hand, immediately after the arrest of Cardinal Wyszyński the Warsaw regime has pushed to the forefront the so-called patriot priests and progressive Catholics. In the memorial of September 12, 1950, the bishops already affirmed that these patriot priests were in conflict with their moral and church obligations, and many of them were under church discipline. As to the so-called progressive Catholics, they were publicly condemned in February 1950 by the Primate Cardinal Wyszyński, who confirmed the fact that their activities and the activities of their publications cannot be considered as Catholic.

In the fall of 1953, after the arrest of Cardinal Wyszyński, the Communists called to life the so-called State Committee of Catholic, Ecclesiastical, and Lay Activists of the National Front.

This committee was given the job of diversional work among the Catholic people. Later the Communists added to this group the "patriot priests," putting them under leadership of "progressive Catholics."

How ineffective was the work of this committee and how effective were the auditions of the western radio, particularly Voice of America, as best evidenced by the statement of the secretary-general of this committee on February 22, 1955, who, despairing on the lack of ability to operate effectively, said:

This national committee having ambitions to influence and to direct the processes of evolutions now going on in the minds of clergy cannot at any time afford to neglect the influence of western radio of diversional character on a certain group of priests and Catholics in general. These radios lost their appeal for the Polish people by unmasking their lies and hatred toward anything which is cherished in the heart of every Pole. Nevertheless these radio programs aim to disturb the minds of the faithful and to exploit for hostile political aims religious feelings and devotion to the church of people.

One of the means used by these western radios—which flatters us because it strengthens our belief in the righteousness of our ideals—is an avalanche of lies and insults directed against our movement. Our strength and our achievements compelled the enemy propaganda to also change its methods. Even they noticed our great movement and ineffectiveness to combat it from outside as it was when they successfully went to isolate progressive Catholic movement. Therefore the struggle has been changed for a diversion with the scope to concentrate on disintegrating processes and opportunistic tendencies within our movement. It is logical—if one is unable to conquer or destroy a movement, if one cannot retract its development, he must try to weaken this movement, to loosen it and undermine its ideals.

And therefore the weight of enemy propaganda is pushing now not on our organizational forces—it is even afraid to use its name—but is attacking the very ideology. The enemy propaganda is trying to undermine among the people its confidence in this ideology and abate its authority. They talk no more about a heretical group or heretical ideology, they discriminate not only people and their activities, but they strike against the fundamental belief of progressive Catholics.

This is the reason why we must come to certain conclusions for our further activity, why we have to deepen morale of our activists and take care of a high moral standard of our leading groups.

This wailing of those who were bent on destroying religious life in Poland is good evidence that their efforts have been unsuccessful and have not fallen on fertile ground.

In the perspective of 10 years of religious persecution in Poland and in the light of the history of 10 years of the war of Communists with God, religion, and the church in Poland, it is now clear how important were the statements of the Polish episcopate. It is obvious that the Communists to the present time have been losing that war. The Polish nation has successfully fought off the attacks. This, however, does not minimize for a moment the dangers which appear to exist. The Communists have chosen Poland as the base of their great diversion war with the entire Christian world.

The so-called patriot priests and progressive Catholics are being used by the Communists to divert activities in various countries in the world. They are being sent to Belgium, France, Italy, and even to North Vietnam and to the United States under the guise of various missions, sometime diplomatic. The Catholic mask is used to conceal their Communist activity to procure advantages for Moscow. We must consider these matters when we reflect on this second anniversary of the historical document, the memorial of the Polish episcopate of May 8, 1953. We must remember that the goal of the Communists is not only to destroy the Catholic world in Poland, but to destroy all religious activities everywhere in the world, including these United States.

## Limiting the Power of Congress

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the other day a proposal in Congress to reduce personal taxes by a meager \$20 a head was called fiscal irresponsibility. That was true because of worse fiscal irresponsibility by Congress for more than 20 years right up to this minute. It has been making appropriations for grants-in-aid, loans, subsidies, and gifts. It has authorized spending, borrowing, and running deficits that make the proposed reduction in taxes impossible—irresponsible. This costs us more than \$10 billion annually. It takes at least 1,400,000 Federal employees to operate our extraneous, unconstitutional functions of government. They cost in salaries and other overhead more than \$6 billion. Nine hundred thousand employees could perform all the legitimate constitutional nonmilitary functions of government—and do a better job.

Our dollars are cut in half with fantastic Federal debts and mortgages amounting to more than half the value of our property. That means that half the value of our private property has been confiscated or transferred to government already. When income is taken up to 92 percent by government that means individual responsibility to manage ourselves and our property is suspended.

Something has to be done about it. Or we shall have unlimited governmental irresponsibility in the management of our affairs permanently fastened upon us.

Indeed, is it not a fact that any people who tolerate mere men exercising unlimited powers over them have become themselves temporarily irresponsible? No sensible organization of men turns loose its officers to do anything they like and spend whatever they please. Their powers are always specified and limited in scope and spending to carry out the stated purposes of the organiza-

tion. Congress is in that ridiculous position of being unlimited in functions and spending power.

Do we need another decade—even another day—to demonstrate that Congress is incapable of correcting its own helplessness without the people's help.

The simple remedy, then, lies in taking away from Congress the excess power to appropriate the people's property which it now exercises. Limiting its spending power necessarily limits its functions. A first step in that direction has been taken by the introduction of an amendment to the Constitution by Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN and Congressman CHAUNCEY W. REED—Senate Joint Resolution 23 and House Joint Resolution 182.

Congressman REED, when he introduced the amendment in the House on January 3, 1955, summarized its provisions as follows:

First. As to income taxes: the amendment limits income taxes on both individuals and corporations to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but permits Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate provided the top rate does not exceed the bottom rate by more than 15 percentage points. For example, if the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate does not exceed 25 percent, however, there is no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for instance, be 1 percent or one-half of 1 percent. Subject to the foregoing limitations, the rates on corporate incomes may vary from those on individual incomes.

Second. Death and gift taxes: The amendment gives to the States the exclusive power to impose death and gift taxes.

The Reed-Dirksen proposal recognizes some basic first principles that the Marxian tax system we now have does not. First, there is a point of diminishing returns in the collection of taxes. Low rates may produce more revenue than high rates. Second, the great bulk of income taxes in a progressive rate system is collected from the lowest tax brackets; and third, that as between separate governmental taxing units, the one closest to the people can perform most efficiently and economically.

The first principle is best illustrated by the use of Henry Ford as an example. In 40 years, Mr. Ford's fortune increased from \$1,000 to \$1 billion. If the Ford Motor Co. had been subjected to a 50-percent income tax during that 40-year period, its net worth would have been only \$1,470,000 and would have paid only \$1,470,000 in taxes; but with a 20-percent income tax the net worth at the end of 40 years would have been \$66,500,000 and taxes collected \$16,600,000 or almost 16 times as much as collections from a 50-percent tax. On that principle American mass-production was built. We have proved to the world that mass-produced, low per unit cost products yield more profits and pay more taxes than high per unit costs and high rates of taxes.

To illustrate: During the 1920's the high World War I tax rates were drastically lowered. The following table shows that although maximum rates

were lowered and personal exemptions increased the revenue yield was greater:

Year	Total internal-revenue collections	Maximum rate (percent)	Personal exemptions
1925.....	\$2,584,140,000	40	\$2,500
1926.....	2,836,000,000	24	3,000
1927.....	2,865,863,000	24	3,500
1929.....	2,939,054,000	20	3,500
1930.....	3,040,146,000	20	3,500

The reason for this is obvious. The great bulk of revenue comes from the first and lowest bracket of the income taxpayers. For many years about 85 percent of all taxes collected have come from the lowest bracket, viz, being the 20-percent bracket. Only 3 percent, or about \$2 billion, is provided by rates in excess of 34 percent.

It is obvious from the foregoing that if the Government continues to require large revenues, the lowest income producers will be required to provide by far the greatest share of taxes. Conversely, tax relief in the lower brackets results in the largest possible reinvestment in production and tends to increase profits and taxes paid to the Government.

So real relief can be effected only by drastically reducing expenditures or by reducing the tax rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive enterprise. As Congressman REED points out, this would increase the national income which constitutes the tax base and thereby increase the revenue.

The most important effect of the amendment is the restoration to the States of the fiscal ability to meet the needs of their people. The States have lost that power to a great extent and consequently have either been forced to rely on the various grants-in-aid programs, or have surrendered to the Federal Government the responsibility for the performance of services that are primarily of State and local concern. This shift of power and responsibility is in clear violation of our constitutional concept that the unit of government closest to the people can most capably serve them. The Constitution provides for a neat division of powers, reserving to the States the bulk of sovereignty and granting only explicit and very limited powers to the Central Government.

This balance has been upset by reckless use of the unlimited taxing power granted to the Federal Government by the 16th amendment and the court interpretations of it. By preempting the tax sources the Central Government has been successful in arrogating to itself virtual control over the lives and property and liberties of the American people. The States exist too much by sufferance and function too often as agents for the distribution of the Federal largesse. The extent of the shift of sovereignty is indicated by the fact that 20 years ago the States and localities collected 75 percent of all tax-revenues in the Nation, while today the Federal Government collects 75 percent. The pen is indeed mightier than the sword, but the power of the purse is invincible.

The Reed-Dirksen proposal reverses this trend toward centralizing government power by restoring to the States

some of the sources of tax revenues. The amendment returns to the States the exclusive power to levy death and gift taxes. These taxes constitute a small item in the Federal tax picture—about 1 percent—but represents a considerable revenue to the States. The right to control the transfer and devolution of property is one of the historical attributes of sovereignty, and clearly belongs to the States. Secondly, the amendment's limitation on confiscatory rates in the higher brackets guarantees to the States that the wealth created within their boundaries will remain there to create more wealth and consequently produce more and greater tax revenues for the States.

The amendment is a compromise, recognizing that in emergency situations the Federal Government must have great fiscal powers. But it also assures the American people of fiscal and, consequently, political sanity in normal times. That is the least we can do for the Nation's 66 million taxpayers.

The following is an address delivered on the floor of the House, January 31, 1955, by Congressman CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois, introducing House Joint Resolution 182—Reed-Dirksen amendment:

#### LIMITING THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO TAX INCOMES, INHERITANCES, AND GIFTS

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the Honorable EVERETT W. DIRKSEN, Senator from Illinois, and I introduced in the House and Senate a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts—House Joint Resolution 103 and Senate Joint Resolution 23. Senator DIRKSEN and I are introducing the same resolution again this year.

The principal provisions of the amendment may be summarized as follows:

##### First. Income taxes:

The amendment limits income taxes on both individuals and corporations to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but permits Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate, provided the top rate does not exceed the bottom rate by more than 15 percentage points. For example, if the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate does not exceed 25 percent, however, there is no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for instance be 1 percent or one-half of 1 percent.

Subject to the foregoing limitations, the rates on corporate income may vary from those on individual incomes.

##### Second. Death and gift taxes:

The amendment also gives to the States the exclusive power to impose death and gift taxes.

It should be observed that the amendment merely limits the degree of tax rate progression. It does not prescribe the top rate that Congress may impose. Hence, it cannot be argued that the amendment impairs the Government's power to raise needed revenue during either peace or war, except, of course, with respect to the revenue derived from the estate and gift taxes, which is only about 1½ percent of the total. In other words, the amendment does not limit the amount of revenue that may be raised, but limits merely the manner in which it may be raised.

Its purpose and effect are merely to eliminate in large measure from our system of taxation its socialistic features; namely,



first, the heavy progressive feature of the income tax; and, second, the confiscatory death tax, which will eventually dry up the sources of private capital and lead to the establishment of socialism with the accompanying loss of the people's liberty.

In a statement to the Temporary Economic Committee prior to World War II, Adolph Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, made the following significant prophecy:

"The Government will have to enter into direct financing of activities now supposed to be private, and a continuance of that direct financing must be (mean) inevitably that the Government will ultimately control and own those activities. \* \* \* Over a period of years the Government will gradually come to own most of the productive plants of the United States."

I am convinced that Mr. Berle's prophecy will come true unless action to prevent it is taken before it is too late.

Legislation by Congress is obviously insufficient; for the work of a good Congress may be easily undone by that of a radical Congress.

The need of reform would seem to be obvious and I know of no way of giving permanence to such reform except through a constitutional amendment.

The ultimate objective of the amendment is a top individual income tax rate of 25 percent and a beginning rate of much less than 10 percent.

In determining whether such an objective is realistic it will be helpful to consider the possible tax effect of a budget of more reasonable proportions than the present one. The budget estimate of expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is \$63.504 billion. According to the Federal Budget in brief, Government expenditures for the comparatively recent fiscal years of 1948 to 1951, inclusive, were as follows:

*Expenditures  
(in billions)*

1951 (which included a full year of the Korean war)-----	\$44.058
1950 -----	39.606
1949 -----	39.507
1948 -----	33.068

Prior to 1942, which was a war year, the largest expenditure of the Federal Government in any year was \$18.4 billion in 1918, which was also a war year.

Let us suppose now the following changes in the budget receipts as estimated for the fiscal year 1955:

First. A reduction in the individual income-tax rates to 10 percent on incomes up to \$10,000 and 25 percent on the amounts in excess of \$10,000; and

Second. Elimination of estate and gift taxes.

These changes would reduce the budget receipts to \$47 billion, which is \$3 billion greater than the budget expenditures for the fiscal year 1951 which included a full year of the Korean war. It is \$7.5 billion greater than the budget expenditures for the fiscal years 1950 and 1949.

A beginning rate of 5 percent, instead of 10 percent, on individual incomes would reduce the receipts to \$41.5 billion. This is \$2 billion above the 1950 and 1949 expenditures, to say nothing of the \$33 billion expenditures in 1948.

It would, of course, take some years to secure the adoption of the amendment, since it must be approved by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

About 85 percent of the estimated revenue from the individual income tax, which produces over half of the total revenue of the Federal Government, is produced by the first bracket rate of 20 percent when applied to the entire amount of taxable income in all brackets. Only 3 percent—about \$2 bil-

lion—is provided by the rates in excess of 34 percent.

Accordingly, if we are to have enormous expenditures and correspondingly large revenue, the great bulk of the revenue must come from persons of small and moderate means. The only possible way to give relief to such persons is either, first, by reducing the need for revenue through cutting expenditures; or, second, by increasing revenue through a drastic reduction of the present confiscatory higher bracket rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive enterprise. This would increase the national income which constitutes the tax base and thereby increase the revenue.

Any immediate loss in revenue through the elimination of the higher individual rates would undoubtedly be only temporary. Eventually the lower rates would produce greater revenue than the higher rates now in force.

Another important effect of the amendment which has not been sufficiently stressed would be to restore to the States the power to be financially independent and to free themselves from Federal domination. The Federal Government should not be permitted to hog the revenue and hand back part of it to the States on conditions.

It should be remembered that with minor exceptions every dollar spent by the Federal Government comes from the same sources of revenue that are available to the States. The States should raise the revenue and spend it themselves. Responsibility for the raising of revenue is one of the best checks upon extravagant and unwise expenditures. It is too easy to spend money raised by someone else.

Moreover, the States and municipalities are better fitted than the Federal Government to perform the services which are primarily of State or local concern and they would do so at much less cost. Performance of these services by the Federal Government has meant the maintenance at great cost of a vast horde of bureaucrats on the Federal payroll, many of whom could readily be dispensed with.

To summarize, the proposed amendment—

First. Largely eliminates from our Federal system of taxation its socialistic features and thereby puts an end to the use of the taxing power as means of forcing us into socialism;

Second. Does not impair the power of the Federal Government to raise revenue;

Third. Does not shift the burden of taxation from the rich to the poor;

Fourth. Aims at reducing eventually the taxes of everyone so that the top rate will not exceed 25 percent and the bottom rate will not exceed 10 percent, with the prospect that it will be much less;

Fifth. With lower rates will increase the national wealth and over the years the Federal revenue;

Sixth. Will restore to the States the power to be financially independent and to free themselves from Federal domination.

In the final analysis the problem resolves itself into the simple issue of whether we are to have in this country a system of society based upon, first, private enterprise and our constitutional form of government; or second, socialism. Both reason and the experience of other countries lead to the conclusion that our present system of confiscatory income and taxes, if long continued, will ultimately result in the establishment of socialism in place of our present system.

The changes in the impact of Federal taxes on the great bulk of the taxpayers involved in the proposed amendment are, as I pointed out, comparatively minor. Their beneficial effect, however, would be far reaching and decisive.

The changes in the income-tax provisions proposed in connection with and partially effected by the 1954 Revenue Code, such as reductions in the tax on dividends and in-

creases in certain deductions and exemptions, are costly in revenue and will have only minor effect on the economy. The major evil to be corrected is the one at which the proposed amendment is aimed.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that this amendment is vastly different from the amendment which has been going through the State legislatures, an amendment which limits the power of Congress to impose income, death, and gift taxes to a maximum rate of 25 percent with no right to suspend the limitation except in time of war. That amendment is altogether too rigid and would seriously impair the Government's power to raise needed revenue from the income tax in time of peace.

The following is an address delivered on the floor of the Senate, January 21, 1955, by Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, introducing Senate Joint Resolution 23—Reed-Dirksen amendment:

THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT  
LIMITING CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO TAX  
INCOMES, INHERITANCES, AND GIFTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in January 1953 the Honorable CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois, introduced in the House, and I introduced in the Senate, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts—House Joint Resolution 103 and Senate Joint Resolution 23.

This amendment would limit income taxes to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but would permit Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate at any time without limit. Where the top rate exceeded 25 percent, however, it could be no more than 15 percentage points above the bottom rate. For example, if the bottom rate were 15 percent, the top rate could not exceed 30 percent. If the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate did not exceed 25 percent, however, there would be no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for example, be 1 percent, or one-half of 1 percent.

This amendment would also deprive Congress of the power to impose death and gift taxes, and would leave these means of raising revenue exclusively to the States, where they belong, and competition among the States would tend to keep the rates within reasonable bounds.

Representative REED and I are introducing this joint resolution again this year.

The proposed amendment has met with wide approval. Important national organizations have endorsed it, including the American Bar Association, the American Legion, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Western Tax Council, the Committee for Constitutional Government, the Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, the National Economic Council, and the National Small Business Men's Association.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of this amendment. Its objective is to save our American incentive system, commonly spoken of as the private-enterprise system, on which our very form of government depends.

Our present system of taxation, with its heavy progressive income and inheritance taxes, will eventually destroy this system and result in the substitution of some form of socialism.

Karl Marx, in his Communist Manifesto of 100 years ago, fully recognized the importance of these taxes as a means of destroying the private-enterprise system by including in the 10 planks in his platform the following:

First. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

Second. Abolition of all right of inheritance.

For the past two decades the Federal Government has been following the course prescribed by Marx by imposing a heavy progressive or graduated income tax, and while not abolishing the right of inheritance, the Federal Government has been increasing the rates of the death tax until the top rate is now 77 percent.

The progression in income-tax rates from the beginning rate of 20 percent on incomes of \$2,000 and under to 91 percent on incomes of more than \$200,000 is progression of a most extreme character. It not only confiscates the larger incomes, but it bears most heavily on the middle incomes, the group at which Marx particularly aimed in his advocacy of heavy graduated income taxes.

Reason and the experience of other nations, and most recently that of England, demonstrate beyond all question that unless our policy of taxation is changed, the system of society under which this country has prospered and grown great will come to an end and some form of socialism or communism will supplant it.

How, one may ask, will the proposed amendment keep the rates down? The answer is this: The amendment would make it in the interest of every taxpayer, first to keep the top rate down to 25 percent—as compared with the present rate of 91 percent; and, second, to keep the bottom rate no higher than 10 percent—as compared with the present rate of 20 percent. It is expected that the beginning rate will ultimately be much less than 10 percent.

The proposed amendment is just as important for the small taxpayer as for the large. This united self-interest of all taxpayers is relied on as a force that would keep the tax rates within reasonable bounds. There are 66 million individual income-tax payers in the United States. Most of them vote.

It should be noted that the proposed amendment merely limits the degree of tax-rate progression. It does not prescribe the top rate that Congress may impose. Hence, it cannot be argued that the amendment impairs the Government's power to raise needed revenue during either war or peace.

The proposed amendment will reduce the burden of taxation on those with the smaller incomes. A fact not generally realized is that the great bulk of the revenue from the individual income tax comes not from the taxpayers with large incomes, but from those with small incomes. That is so simply because the small incomes, in the aggregate, constitute the bulk of the national income. For example, only 3 percent—about \$2 billion—of the total estimated Federal revenue of about \$60 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is produced by the individual income-tax rates above 34 percent, which is 14 percentage points above the present beginning rate of 20 percent.

Contrast these figures with the effect of an increase of only \$100 in the present \$600 personal exemption and credit for dependents. Such an increase would result in a reduction of 7 million in the number of income-tax payers and a revenue loss of \$2.5 billion. This is one-half billion dollars more than the total revenue received from the individual income-tax rates above 34 percent.

Accordingly, if we are to have enormous expenditures and correspondingly large revenue, the great bulk of the revenue must come from persons of small and moderate means.

The only possible way to give relief to the small-tax payers is either (1) by reducing the need for revenue through cutting expenditures, or (2) by increasing revenue through a drastic reduction of the present confiscatory higher bracket rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive en-

terprise. This would increase the national income, which constitutes the tax base, and thereby increase the revenue.

Any immediate loss in revenue through the elimination of the higher individual rates would undoubtedly be only temporary. Eventually, the lower rates would produce greater revenue than the higher rates now in force.

That the present confiscatory rates of the individual income tax are not approved by a large majority of the American people is shown by Gallup polls. The vote of those having an opinion was 2 to 1 in favor of a 25-percent top limit in the September 1951 poll, and 3 to 1 in the July 1952 poll.

As I have already stated, the proposed amendment also deprives Congress of the power to impose death and gift taxes and leaves these means of raising revenue exclusively to the States, where they belong, and where competition among the States would tend to keep the rates within reasonable bounds. Under existing laws the tax on the estates of decedents runs to a high of 77 percent, and the tax on gifts to 57.75 percent. These rates are manifestly confiscatory, and they have very harmful economic effects. They not only seriously impair the incentive to work, save, and invest in productive enterprise, but they are extremely destructive of capital and, in the long run, will destroy the accumulations of capital that are so necessary for industrial activity and expansion, with the resulting beneficial effects on our economy.

Moreover, the heavy taxation of large estates compels the rich to seek comparatively safe liquid investments in order to provide for the heavy taxes that will be imposed upon their estates at death, thus further reducing the capital available for risky business ventures.

The harm done to the economy by the present high rates of death and gift taxes is out of all proportion to the revenue produced, and cannot be justified by any argument based on fiscal needs. Even with the very high rates now in force, the revenue from these taxes is comparatively trivial. In 1953 it was \$891 million from the two sources. This was a little over 1 percent of the total budget of \$74 billion—enough to pay the Government's expenses for about 4 days. The gift tax is merely auxiliary to the estate tax, and both should be dealt with alike.

Of particular concern is the destructive effect of the heavy estate taxes on small business. The conclusions of the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States Senate in its report published in June 1953 was that estate taxes often lead to the disappearance of small or medium-sized independent businesses or their merger with the dominant segment of an industry.

Let me add that this statement represents not only my own views but those of Representative REED, who joins me in making the statement.

### Tax Deductions for Care of Mentally and Physically Handicapped Dependents

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which would provide tax deductions for expenses incurred

in the care of mentally and physically handicapped dependents. This would amend the present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which limit these deductions to a woman or a widower or to a husband who is legally separated from his wife.

Under the present regulation, a man either has to be divorced or legally separated from a mentally or physically disabled wife or else a widower in order to qualify for deductions for expenses incurred in the care of his children. I cannot believe that it was the intent of Congress to discriminate in favor of either death or divorce. A taxpayer having dependents who are mentally or physically incapable of caring for themselves often find it impossible to provide this care personally and maintain his or her employment at the same time. In such a situation, it seems to me that a taxpayer is entitled to relief. By amending section 214 (C) of the Internal Revenue Code, my bill provides this relief not only to women, widowers, and divorcees, but also to those who have maintained their matrimonial ties.

### Everyone Is Hard Up

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, with prosperity—if determined by dollars in hand—not just around the corner—not sitting on the doorstep—but inside, right at the elbow, practically everyone is having money trouble. It will increase when money becomes tight.

#### INDIVIDUALS' TROUBLES

An industrial executive had a yearly salary of \$75,000; an annual income of an equal amount from dividends. He did not drink, gamble, entertain socially, nor spend his money foolishly. He had a good but modest home in a comparatively small city. He had a summer place in the West; tried to get a month's annual vacation.

However, the demands made upon him for contributions for charitable and other purposes, and which he felt he could not resist, kept him in a financially tight situation where he had to take a look at his checking account before deciding upon any sizable expenditure. His salary and dividends came from a business which he had created, which gave employment to upward of 3,000 people at above the average wage scale. He was as hard pressed for current funds as the lowest paid employee.

Another acquaintance, a professional man in a small community, makes between 30 and 40 thousand a year and though his tastes are moderate, is always hard up when income tax day rolls around.

Then, I know many conservative, would-be industrious citizens who, because they are past 45, find it difficult



to get a job. Others, older—notwithstanding social security or other Government payments, find it extremely difficult to get their hands on funds enough to enable them to live comfortably, even though they have no expensive habits. They suffer more than any other group.

#### THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The Federal Government, which collects billions of dollars from the taxpayers—it has no other source of revenue—makes no serious effort to live within its income.

The Government on just one item alone—storage of farm surpluses—each day adds \$1 million to its national debt—the annual interest charge on which is now upwards of \$6.4 billion—but there is still no solution of the farm problem. Farm prices, notwithstanding rigid support, continue to drop.

Municipalities, as well as individuals, seem to have accepted literally the Biblical statement "Ask and ye shall receive"—forgotten that the Federal Government, which sometimes collects \$2.19 for each dollar it passes out, does not have creative power—forgotten that "The Lord helps those who help themselves."

#### THE ANSWER?—IT IS OBVIOUS

Our creative and productive ability has increased far beyond our dreams, but we follow the methods of the Prodigal Son; waste our priceless inheritance. Spend beyond our needs—for things desirable but not strictly necessary. Buying but not paying—postponing to future generations whose welfare we seem to have forgotten the day of reckoning.

Unpleasant as it may be, consideration for those we bring into the world demands that as individuals, as government, we limit our spending to the purchase of necessities—to what we earn or have ability to repay—in the near future.

Unless we do, some of us may live to regret it. Certainly those who come after will have cause to condemn us.

#### Personal Explanation

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JACK WESTLAND**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 days I have been pretty much flat on my back with a virus that bit me rather severely, and I have been unable to attend the sessions of the House. From the look of the RECORD, it seems as though there have been more rollcalls, quorum calls, and votes than might have occurred normally in the period of a couple of weeks. Since I had no control over the timing when those bugs were going to bite, I was unable to attend the sessions and consequently have no recorded votes on the bills which came up on the floor of the House.

However, had I been present I would have voted for the conference report on

the postal pay raise. Although I firmly believe the President will veto the present bill, I nevertheless feel the bill should get before the President for his immediate action so it can become law or be vetoed. Then the Congress can quit playing politics with the purse strings of the postal and civil-service employees of this country and produce legislation which will put money into their pockets now.

I also would have voted against recommitment of the Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill, for I believe both Territories are ready for statehood. According to the RECORD, there was a lot of talk about Communist influence and Harry Bridges in the Hawaiian Islands and apparently for that reason, a lot of the Members voted against statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. I thought the remarks of Congressman RUSSELL MACK, of Washington, were very pertinent when he stated:

Why should we punish Hawaii by depriving her of statehood for something that we ourselves have not done?

In other words, the United States had been unable to get rid of Harry Bridges during a period of a good many years, yet some would deprive Hawaii of statehood for inability to get rid of him in a comparatively short time. This reasoning seems entirely illogical to me.

Coming from a district which is close to Alaska, I am particularly concerned with statehood for that Territory. I believe the people of Alaska have demonstrated their ability to govern themselves and to become a member of the United States. I therefore would have voted in favor of statehood for both of these Territories.

#### Fishers Island Sound

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. THOMAS J. DODD**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to the bill which I have introduced calling for a full investigation of the problem of protecting the shores of Fishers Island Sound from storm and hurricane tidal floods, H. R. 6093, I wish to bring to the attention of the House today some additional information.

If I were to predict that during the next Atlantic hurricane season millions of dollars in personal property and many entire industries now located on Connecticut shores will be wiped out, I believe that this body would institute some sort of emergency powers to get action in time to prevent such a catastrophe.

Well, after personally inspecting the Fishers Island Sound area last weekend I do so predict—if last year's violence is repeated. The Stonington area, for example, where one of my Hartford constituents' plant is located, will suffer damage not alone from the extreme violence of a hurricane but even more likely from the lesser furies of Atlantic storms

which now sweep in from the east and southeast with increasing regularity.

A native son of Stonington and president of the Stonington Boat Works, Inc., Mr. Henry R. Palmer, Jr., has proposed what appears to be the best defense at the least expense for this extremely vulnerable area. His plan, which suggests a series of breakwaters extending on a broken line, following the reefs, from Watch Hill Point, R. I., to the east point of Fishers Island, N. Y., promises protection for the greatest number of people and their properties. I have yet to see a so-called coastal erosion plan by a single construction project which would protect such an extensive area as these shores of Fishers Island Sound in Rhode Island, New York, and Connecticut.

The proposed Palmer breakwaters would restore that line of reefs from Watch Hill Point to East Point, Fishers Island, to its former protective status.

Since those reefs have been flattened, in recent years, and only since then, has Stonington Harbor lost its value as a harbor of refuge. In a strong easterly storm there is no harbor of refuge now between New London, Conn., and Point Judith, R. I. A comparison of older charts with the new will show that Stonington Harbor, for example, has lost its usefulness as such in almost direct ratio with the gradual lowering of those reef barriers.

Consequently, heavy seas now sweep into the Stonington area directly from the Atlantic Ocean and the wave action continues on down the Connecticut shoreline in a westerly direction. This, I say, happens during easterly storms, which occur with increasing regularity. Water damage along this extensive Connecticut coastline is still greater during the hurricane season.

Connecticut, like many other States, is anxiously trying to attract new industry. But many long-established industries along this Connecticut coastline have said they would leave if they must suffer the severe water damage of 1938, of 1944, of 1954; resulting from the cumulative power of Atlantic wave action; if they must be continually threatened by storm-driven seas which now enter Fishers Island Sound over the once-protective reef line between Watch Hill and Fishers Island. Even the Stonington fishing fleet, Connecticut's largest, will have to seek refuge elsewhere unless Federal action is forthcoming soon.

I have therefore introduced a bill asking for authority to investigate and correct this situation by the construction of breakwaters to protect the entire Fishers Island Sound area. Since personally inspecting the reef line between Watch Hill, R. I., and Fishers Island, N. Y., last Friday, I am more convinced than ever that this is our first line of defense. I ask that the provisions of this bill be given immediate consideration by the Secretary of the Army and that he instruct the Chief of Engineers to expedite the necessary survey and immediately to take appropriate action in the most expeditious manner possible toward the construction of those breakwaters.

I am well aware of the hazards of hurricane violence which threaten the en-

tire Atlantic seaboard. However, while I respect the needs of others, I would remind this body that to my knowledge no other such extensive and heavily populated and highly assessed area so threatened can be so readily protected by a single project of breakwaters construction. The need is apparent to those who would study and compare the coastal charts, past and present. It is a need which can be fulfilled, and easily so, whenever authorized by Congress.

I ask that this project be given serious consideration, that it be given the same degree of priority in any overall Atlantic seaboard coastal erosion legislation that the area in question was given by the hurricanes of 1938, of 1944, of 1954.

**"American Secretaries Are Bringing to Their Positions Today a Wider Knowledge of Business and World Affairs Than Considered Necessary in the Past"**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year, Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks declared April 23-30 as National Secretaries Week. All over the country that week our great band of girl Fridays took bows for their very real contribution to our American way of life. Moreover, the 300 chapters of the National Secretaries Association—International—observed the week by highlighting the educational projects for which it has gained national recognition and which have been of tremendous benefit to secretaries and management.

I was proud, indeed, Mr. Speaker, when my own secretary on Capitol Hill, Miss Marjorie Clough, of Cleveland, Ohio, who has been associated with me for almost 10 years, was invited to speak at an all-day workshop meeting of the chapters of the National Secretaries Association of Greater Youngstown, Ohio.

When Miss Clough reported to the Congressman representing Youngstown—the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN—that she was going into his district, he presented her with a toy donkey which I feel sure she will cherish, especially as Mr. KIRWAN emphasized the nonpartisanship of the little mascot. And he further asked her to convey his greetings to the meeting.

Miss Ann C. Hudak and others of Youngstown had skillfully arranged a full day of activities at the beautiful Butler Art Institute. Included on the program was another good friend of mine from Cleveland, Mr. A. L. Bittkofer, supervisor of character education for the Cleveland public schools, who conducted a lively discussion on human relations in and out of business.

May I express my appreciation at this time to the United States Information Agency and to Mr. William Hamilton, of the public information staff, who generously arranged to have Miss Clough take with her a color movie which vividly portrays what our Government is doing to combat Soviet propaganda behind the Iron Curtain. The showing of this film added greatly to the program of the day.

Mr. Speaker, because I know Miss Clough was speaking for and about us all in this great body, I believe my colleagues will enjoy reading what she said that day in Youngstown. Under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith the tribute of Secretary Weeks to the American secretary and Miss Clough's statement:

**THE SECRETARY SENSES THE NEED**

(Remarks of Miss Marjorie Clough, executive assistant to Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, Member of Congress, before a meeting of the Youngstown Chapters, National Secretaries' Association, April 30, 1955)

It is a privilege to be here today to join with this distinguished group in paying honor to secretaries everywhere.

When Miss Helmes, of the Women's Bureau in Washington, told me of this workshop you are holding today, I was gratified to know that I would be invited to take part in it.

Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks is to be commended for proclaiming National Secretaries' Week across the Nation.

Indeed, I think there is special significance for our great army of Girl Fridays in another announcement which came from Mr. Weeks' office this week: The announcement which told of the high state of the Nation's prosperity.

For I would say that without the secretary, equipped as she is with a sort of built-in radar system we call the sixth sense—I doubt if such a record could have been possible by the great and small enterprises which constitute the American way of life.

To be in Youngstown itself, is a privilege. I come from a family of men who have long dealt in steel and the products of steel. I understand what it means to the prosperity of our Nation when the night skies over Youngstown and Bethlehem and Pittsburgh and Cleveland are aglow from the white-hot furnaces and open hearths of the greatest steel industry in the world.

And may I take this moment to tell you what I am sure you already know: That the people of Youngstown are fortunate to be represented in Congress by Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN. A high compliment was paid to him recently by a friend who said: "MIKE KIRWAN is MIKE KIRWAN 365 days of the year." It can certainly be said that he puts the welfare of the country and of his people above and beyond party politics.

You may wonder why I have been chosen to speak at your meeting today. They say I am a successful secretary. I don't know whether or not this is true.

What I do know is that from the first day on that first job many years ago—paying \$60 a month, Monday through Saturday—I have been filled with faith in the role which an obscure girl could someday play in our society.

I hope I am not mistaken when I say that only in America are the men and women at Cabinet level, the men and women of the President's Cabinet who make foreign policy and defense policy and domestic policy—known as secretaries!

And today when my Congresswoman leaves the supervision of her congressional office to me when on some important mission in our country or abroad, I realize that the faith of

the obscure girl at the Woodstock typewriter has been confirmed.

They say I am a successful secretary. I don't know whether this is true or not. I do know that I am associated with a wonderful woman in Washington.

In order to tell you about my work, I must tell you something about Congressman BOLTON.

FRANCES P. BOLTON

Public life was nothing new to Mrs. Bolton when the death of her husband, the late Hon. Chester C. Bolton, left a vacant seat in the House of Representatives in 1939. She had had 10 years as wife of a Congressman, and had gone through many campaigns at his side, and made many speeches in his behalf.

But now she faced an important decision of her own, whether or not to run for the seat left vacant in Congress. There were the inaudible suggestions that as a woman she was not sufficiently educated in the law or one of the professions. There were the fears and doubts which seem always to beset men and women when comes the call to higher service.

But having put her hand to the plow, and winning that first election hands down back in 1940—she hasn't looked back, but has pushed steadily forward into new and challenging experiences which have inspired men and women everywhere.

Mrs. Bolton is a highly respected member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Her thought reaches out to the problems of peoples and nations around the world as their affairs touch upon our own at the international level.

Her deep sense of humanity and understanding of the basic needs of mankind, make her the staunch ally of America's friends the world over.

Mrs. BOLTON enjoys the unqualified confidence not only of her colleagues in Congress, but of the leaders of the executive branch as well. This was borne out when President Eisenhower appointed her the first woman Member of Congress to serve as a delegate to the United Nations. Her services there involved the daily handling of strategic information of the highest classification.

Men grumble a bit sometimes, about women in positions of responsibility. Here's a personal observation to end all grumbling:

A staff member of the Foreign Affairs Committee told me one day that Mrs. BOLTON was one of the few legislators he had ever seen—man or woman—who could influence votes in a committee meeting through pure logic and persuasive ability. She tries to resolve conflict of opinion and bring about a workable and just compromise.

He went on to say that she was the person who had convinced him that women have a constructive place to fill in public life. "Frankly, until I saw her in operation, I thought women ought to stay home."

What a tribute to woman's place in American endeavor today.

A little more about Mrs. BOLTON.

Hard work and long hours on the Hill are what the job demands in Congress. Mrs. BOLTON gives freely of both. She is a perfectionist to the smallest detail, but asks nothing from those around her which she does not first demand from herself. She finds no time in her active life for small talk about people or things.

Her wit and good humor save many a situation in our busy office. Some weeks ago I found a newspaper clipping propped under my nose—at a moment of when things were going "seven ways to Sunday" as Mrs. Bolton often says.

The story told about a young woman applying for a secretarial position.

"What are your special qualifications," she was asked?



Her reply: "I can look like a woman and think like a man, act like a lady, and work like a dog."

The business of thinking and acting like a whole-souled woman is what is important to FRANCES BOLTON.

#### STAYING IN CONGRESS

Let nobody tell you that it is easy for a man or a woman to serve in Congress. It takes something special to get there, and something very special to stay.

That something special isn't just the ability to wage fiery battle for some piece of legislation, to meet the needs of constituents, to make quick decisions or to write good letters. Some or all of this, to be sure, is fabricated into the warp and woof of what is called a leader of people.

In my humble judgment, what it takes mostly to stay on in Congress year after year, piling good record upon good record, is not so much the people's faith in the Congressman, as the Congressman's faith in the people. It is the deep conviction that there is far more goodness than badness in the simplest of us; that every human soul is striving for a happier, freer, more secure way of life, and has the right to. It is the deep assurance that one can trust most of these aspirations most of the time, and know that out of them all will come something better, not worse.

Could this not be what George Washington meant when he wrote: "The aggregate happiness of society is, or ought to be, the end of all government."

Our first President spoke not of the special needs of this or that group, but of the happiness of society as a whole. He urged that the energies of government at all levels—local, State, National—concern themselves with what is best for all, not some, in the serious business of making the laws of the land.

How much easier said than done, friends. I have seen our statesmen on the floors of Congress making decisions of grave import to the peace and security of these United States. I have felt the pressures they are under. It is far from easy to think objectively of the whole, when the voices of special interest raise hue and cry. For whether the issue be the always troublesome tariff question, or the number of refugees we bring into our country each year, a labor-management dispute, or the cost of butter, the issues are always debated in terms of the happiness and prosperity of some one, or some group.

The spirit which permeates the foregoing brief passage on the life of FRANCES BOLTON—and what it means to be a Congressman—is the spirit which has filled my life these past 9 years.

#### A SECRETARY LOOKS AT WASHINGTON

And now permit me to give you a fleeting glimpse of Washington itself—your Capital and mine—the city which is today writing history for millions of people in many lands. America has had to assume a position of leadership among the nations, not because of her material abundance—O wonder of providence that it is—but because of that spirit of freedom and liberty which cradled her birth a short 200 years ago.

Come, drive home from work with me on an evening in April. The rush hour is past. The sun has sunk. The soft evening air is fragrant with springtime's wonders.

Let's stop for a moment and climb the steps of that glorious temple we know as Lincoln Memorial. From the summit, one has an unobstructed view of the Capitol dome to the east. Below our feet lies the long reflecting pool, and framed within it the eternal shadow of the lofty Washington Monument. At one end of an imaginary bar which crosses this sweeping view of the Capitol lies the White House. On the other, the marble rotunda of the Jefferson Memorial. Just behind us, and across the Poto-

mac, the stately mansion of Robert E. Lee looks down from its natural pedestal on his own beloved Virginia hills.

The white crosses and tombstones of Arlington Cemetery lie folded within those hills just across the river. In the quiet of evening one can almost hear the measured step of the sentry pacing his perpetual watch before the tomb of the soldier "Known but to God."

But morning brings other glimpses of life in our beautiful Capital City.

There are the miles of wide boulevards spoking out from the Capitol Grounds and the miles of Government buildings, with their miles of corridors.

There are the storied shelves and the row after row of books in famed Library of Congress, and the seemingly endless queues of wide-eyed visitors around our historic sights, in the hot summer sun.

And everywhere in Washington there is the reminder of more gentle yesterdays which our Capital City has known. Red brick houses close to the road, flanked by shaded walks and alleys, cobbled streets and narrow, walled-in gardens to the rear, all whisper of genial colonial life in the early days of our Republic. Fashionable Georgetown society is preserving these lovely relics for modern living.

Elsewhere there is noisy evidence of new buildings springing up in answer to the incessant demand for modern offices and up-to-the-minute dwellings.

There is still another aspect of life in Washington, friends. A shocking picture it is to those who visit our Capital for the first time; slums within the shadow of the Capitol dome!

What a spectacle all this makes: the stately side by side with the sordid; the traditional vying with the modern, growth, change, displacement.

As you know, Washington has a large Negro population. There was a time when these citizens were not an integral part of life as a whole in Washington. Today they are slowly taking their rightful places among us.

Construction of the beautiful Supreme Court Building—that highest Court of the land which so recently handed down the decision on segregation—displaced hundreds of Negro families. The splendid marble building which is soon to house the Teamsters Union; and the New Senate Office likewise displaced their hundreds.

Where have these families gone? They are already becoming integrated in all areas of our Capital City. We are indeed setting an example to the Nation.

#### THE SECRETARY AT WORK ON CAPITOL HILL

Now where is the secretary in all of this—the young woman whom we are honoring today?

Picture her on Capitol Hill, representing the 48 stars in our flag, coming from every walk of life, laboring for every field of endeavor.

In a word, she is all of us.

Can she remain apart from all I have just discussed? I think not. As she emerges in the evening from buildings on the Hill you might think her day's work was over. But like you who have achieved success the hard way, she too must fill some portion of her evening hours with study and more work.

She stops at the beautiful Library of Congress—Congress' own Library—the largest in the world, to gather statistics. Passing through the portals and down the ornate corridors to the comfortable Reading Room, she ponders the timeless words of Francis Bacon:

"Reading maketh a full man; conference a ready man; and writing an exact man."

Going home that evening to retire before another long day of work, is her mind quite free of the issues argued that day in the Halls of Congress? Not entirely. Not if she is

the secretary who senses the need. You may be sure that, like her own Member of Congress, the problems and decisions of the day—for constituent and the Nation—weigh upon her thought.

There was the problem of sudden death in the family of a boy serving in our Armed Forces. Had they done everything possible to bring him home?

There was the pitiful letter from the aging widow of a Spanish-American war veteran. What help was there for her?

There was the group of farmers eager to have the Congressman understand the responsibilities they bear in feeding the American people.

There were conflicting engagements on the calendar. Had the most important ones been given preference?

The mail that day had brought more than the usual requests for assistance in the knotty cases of immigrants and refugees seeking asylum in our country.

A constituent dropped in unexpectedly from back home. The constituent is indeed the most important person on Capitol Hill. He must be given time to tell his story to the Congressman before leaving Washington. But when? Can the secretary do the impossible and arrange a meeting when the Member must be closeted all day in executive hearings, keeping one eye on the floor, where rollcalls are expected, and the other on his office?

When will the Congressman write the speech which must be delivered that weekend in his district?

True, there is aid from the experienced staff to deal with all these problems. In some congressional offices there is the legal expert who carefully scans the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each morning, keeps track of the issues, their meaning, and the status of bills on the legislative calendars.

There is the experienced researcher and writer, constructing speeches for the Member out of scraps he has written on the backs of envelopes, preparing statements for the press.

There are the countless tasks which no machine yet conceived can do: the gracious notes of thanks, preparing tickets for travel, keeping harmony between overworked staff members, parceling out the work from an incoming mail basket filled six times each day by mail handlers within the building. The eternal jangling of the phones causes continuous interruptions, but telephone voices must show no irritation.

Time and again it is proven that the secretary, or the person in the executive position, must rely on that something which we like to call the sixth sense to make everything click like a precision instrument.

Even Sally Brown must rely on this sixth sense.

#### Who Is Sally Brown?

Sally is gay and pretty and young. She had 2 years of junior college and 3 months at business school. Her grades were good. She hurried through business school because of general aptitudes and her eagerness to be earning.

Sally is willing to learn, if someone is willing to teach her. She tries to keep personal telephone calls to a minimum, to come to work on time, and to work fairly constantly between breaks for coffee, lunch, coffee, and going home. She's even willing to cut her lunch period short if she must fly home at 5 for an early date.

But, friends, this young woman, except for some miracle of circumstance, is not long for our profession. She is on her way to a more exciting job, a long vacation, or whatever else will give relief from humdrum routine and the business of getting ahead—way ahead.

Her job is primarily for the purpose of earning a livelihood. She is perhaps filling a gap between young womanhood and marriage.

Now, I will not argue as to whether Sally and Joe will make a happy union, since this most wonderful institution of matrimony itself takes talent and imagination, sacrifice, and, above all, devotion to ideals.

Fortunately for Sally, American enterprise furnishes thousands of opportunities to keep her gainfully employed during this interim state of existence. But it is sad to realize that this young woman will miss the opportunities everywhere prevalent—in every business endeavor—to apply her talents in a way to pay rich rewards to herself and her employer.

Friends, I have not come to Youngstown today to speak about Sally Brown, because she is not representative of the secretary who has won laurels for our profession over the decades.

There is an extraordinary shortage of expert secretaries today. Despite the Sally Browns, and despite the fact that employers are paying higher salaries than ever before, there just aren't enough of them to care for the Nation's business.

#### AMERICA'S MECHANICAL SERVANTS

The wonders of the 20th century have brought to offices the marvelous machines and timesavers of which we are all familiar. They have literally taken labor off the backs and out from under the fingers of stenographers, typists, bookkeepers, and many others.

May I, at this point, pay tribute to these wonderful machines, and to the creative genius of the manufacturers who gave them to us.

Like many a GI stationed all over the world, I have seen the look of tragedy and suffering in the faces of our brothers and sisters in the Far East, staggering under backbreaking labor all their lives for want of the automatic servants which we in America take so much for granted.

I have seen the look of childlike wonder come into the eyes of an Indian bearer running his finger over the sharply honed edge of an American razor blade. I have seen a woman's finger caress a safety pin. I have found such booty as a sewing needle, a tube of tooth paste, a broken fountain pen, a can of milk, rolled up in a bit of dirty cloth and tucked away in a secret hiding place.

Friends, I repeat here something I have said many times before, that in the treasury of the Queen of Sheba, with its rare and priceless gems, its ivory, tapestries and cloth of gold, were not such riches as can be found today on a single counter of an American 5- and 10-cent store.

Let us think often of the genius behind the tools which have brought into practical being our American way of life. From the indispensable zipper to the powerful hydraulic presses which stamp out automobile bodies at a single blow, these are the servants of Americans. And we are fast introducing them to people all over the world or their comfort and their well-being, just as fast as they can be absorbed into their economies.

#### GOOD SECRETARIES ALWAYS IN DEMAND

Figures show that only about 15 percent of the offices in our country have accepted these mechanical timesavers.

But I submit, friends, that if and when every business establishment in our Nation has the means to buy every modern machine invented, they will not have engaged the heart and soul of the secretary, or that sixth sense by which she has grown into a citizen with specific and definite responsibilities.

The bell tolls today for secretaries everywhere. They no longer dare to look upon their profession as a source of livelihood only—necessary as that is to us all. The secretary can and must create the power to serve her fellowman and her country with

more skill than ever before, and with more dedication of purpose.

Her services are demanded even beyond the boundaries of our country. I was told just this week how many women are needed today in our foreign service. They must of course have adequate education, and meet other standards, but first and foremost they must have an appreciation for the high significance of serving their country abroad. Many women in our foreign service have risen to posts of great importance due to the faithful application of the talents which they took to their posts.

The age is past when the secretary's share in our common heritage was insignificant. Ours is no more a society which excludes certain professions from full participation in duties and privileges.

#### AMERICA THE BASTION OF FREEDOM

America has accepted world leadership with all its costs and dangers. We have become the most prosperous and dynamic unit of production the human race has ever known.

We are a vast empire with an enormous reach into all the oceans, and with obligations and responsibilities on every continent.

But all around these continents of the Americas there is dreadful evidence of man's inhumanity to man. There are countries where oppression represents a threat to our own borders. In these countries men are not free but are deprived of those inalienable rights upon which our own way of life is based and which we take so much for granted.

Here in Youngstown you make steel. In many countries behind the Iron Curtain citizens peer out from behind prison cells of steel.

Recently Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said in Washington: "Today a third of the world's population—800 million people—live in a nightmare world which has no counterpart in the world of reality."

And wasn't it Abraham Lincoln who expressed the conviction that the ideals of freedom contained in the Declaration of Independence should "give hope to all the world for all future time?"

Not only have those words of Lincoln not yet materialized, but our country is in a position today of having to defend its own freedoms.

Why are these freedoms in danger?

Because totalitarianism, which today enslaves 800 million people is trying to persuade these people that life in America under our constitutional process of government is worse than life in concentration camps.

If these 800 million people are persuaded to believe these pernicious lies, it may be very difficult to keep totalitarianism away from our borders.

#### VOICE OF AMERICA

America, therefore, is faced with the important problem of trying to get in touch with these people, to tell them the true story about our country and our way of life. We are not telling them that we are going to liberate them—let's be clear about that—nor are we trying to force our way of life upon them. But we are trying to explain that we truly mean it when we say that we want to live at peace with the entire world.

The Secretary then, like every citizen who loves his freedom, should solemnly consider the meaning of the activities of that agency of Government which we call the Voice of America. Its vast network of powerful transmitters is carrying America's message in 38 languages to the oppressed of the world.

Through this agency, as Mr. Dulles said, 800 million people of the world are receiving the only "gleam of truth, and perhaps the hope and courage to keep them alive."

It is possibly too early to tell what the true effectiveness of this costly program is. What we do know is that the best experts of Soviet Russia have put millions of dollars into the most modern jamming apparatus that can be contrived in an attempt to prevent the beams coming from America from reaching the ears of millions behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

In a few minutes you will see a short film descriptive of the operation of this dynamic program.

May I say at this point that the United States Information Agency is today recruiting people—both men and women—for its staffs at home and abroad.

This Agency is not alone in needing able secretaries to fill the many vacant posts through Government. The point to remember is that special requirements are needed for each of them, and proper application should be made to the respective agencies. Congressional offices don't get you these jobs, but are happy to supply information as to how applications can be made.

#### THE CHALLENGE TO AMERICANS ALL

In conclusion, may I say that a more somber word of warning was never written in any age than that which we find inscribed on the beautiful Archives Building in Washington: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

The challenges of the 20th century and the atomic age call for dedicated men and women to carry the burdens of high office.

One thing is sure. What the most insignificant citizen feels unable to do, his Congressman—perhaps even his President—may not be able to do. Because, ladies and gentlemen, the President, your Senators, and your Representatives in this free country of ours, are the people.

My appeal to secretaries then, is:

Be not just skilled and alert in carrying out the functions of our profession, but ready and eager to offer a higher service by understanding both our domestic and foreign policies.

Remember that no individual or no smallest private industry can exist today apart from those interests and responsibilities which are the lot of our Government to carry. And because we stand closer than ever to the bastions where a life-and-death struggle may be going on in defense of our freedom, it is indeed a moment of grave importance to us all.

When foreboding clouds threatened the beloved country of Abraham Lincoln in 1861, as he took leave of his friends in Springfield, he spoke certain words which have deep meaning, I believe, for America today.

I could not do better than to leave these immortal words with you:

"Without the assistance of that Divine Being, I cannot succeed. With that assistance, I cannot fail. Trusting in Him, who can go with me, and remain with you, and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well."

A TRIBUTE TO THE AMERICAN SECRETARY, NATIONAL SECRETARIES' WEEK, APRIL 23-30, AND NATIONAL SECRETARIES' DAY, APRIL 27

In keeping with the best traditions of their profession, secretaries throughout the United States are shouldering vital responsibilities. They are performing important roles in commerce, industry, and government, and are bringing to their positions a wider knowledge of world affairs and of the affairs of business than was considered a necessary part of their sphere in the past.

The American secretary is an integral part of the economy which has brought to the world the American way of life—free enterprise, freedom of choice, and the highest standards of living existing in today's troubled world.



To honor the secretaries already performing their duties with diligence; to pay tribute to those constantly striving to improve their skills and abilities better to equip themselves as a part of the management team; and to encourage others to enter this worthy profession, it is essential that rightful recognition be given.

Therefore, during this special week we should fully honor the first lady of business—the American secretary.

SINCLAIR WEEKS,  
Secretary of Commerce.  
LILYAN MILLER,  
President, National Secretary Association.

SHELDON F. HALL,  
President, Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute.

### Confusing and Discouraging

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if there is one policy of the Eisenhower administration which has received the united support of Republicans, as well as substantial support of

Democrats, it is the effort to get the Government out of businesses which can be carried on by individuals or private organizations.

This because thinking individuals know that, inasmuch as Government depends upon tax dollars for its existence, every time the Government eliminates a business which pays taxes it lessens its ability to operate—or must replace the lost tax by additional levies.

In the 83d Congress, without opposition, the House passed a bill introduced by me, the purpose of which was to get the Government out of taxpaying businesses. It was late in the session, hence, the bill did not reach the floor of the Senate.

The administration, by Executive action, has been trying to get the Government out of civilian activities, but legislation is needed.

May 12, last, when the bill making appropriations of \$31,488,206,000 for the Department of Defense came before the House, it carried a section which made it difficult for the administration to curtail Government operations. An amendment designed to further the administration's purpose to get the Government out of activities usually performed by taxpayers was first adopted by the House when in committee by a vote of 160 to 134, but, then on rollcall, was defeated by a vote of 102 to 184. Some Members for no apparent reason reversed their position.

#### INCONSISTENCY

When the amendment came on for a vote in committee, those who had supported a similar principle in the 83d Congress again consistently voted for it; but on the rollcall vote, many switched positions and voted against it.

Naturally, no Member attempts to tell another how he should vote but it certainly is surprising to see Members of Congress within an hour on as simple and sound a proposition as was this do an about face.

Perhaps one reason for a switch from a position designed to protect the taxpayers to one permitting the Government to engage in commercial activities was in part due to the fact that the Member had a Government enterprise in his District.

The vote not only found the leaders on the Republican side in opposite camps but it also found top-ranking members of the Committee on Appropriations on opposite sides.

#### DISCOURAGING

Here is the discouraging feature of that action. Everyone knows that, if the Federal Government is to transact the business normally carried on by taxpayers, whether it be production, transportation, merchandizing, or storage of any item, crowding the taxpayer out, ultimately it will destroy itself. Republicans missed the boat on this one. Reason—lack of vigilance, party organization, personal interest.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 13, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, turning aside for this hallowed moment from the violence and turbulence of these embittered days, we would hush the words of the wise and the prattle of the foolish. In Thy presence our faith is strengthened in the supremacy of ultimate decencies. In the silence we hear the ancient assurance: Be still, and know that I am God.

We pray that Thy cool hand may be laid upon our fretting natures and our fevered spirits. Make us quiet before Thee, quiet enough to see the paths our feet must tread, quiet enough to hear Thy voice, quiet enough to realize that in Thy will is our peace and that Thou wilt never leave us without guidance. Teach us by Thy lessons. Show us Thy purpose. Sober us by Thy chastisements, and make us the instruments of a durable peace as in this hour of crisis and tension we lift our living Nation a single sword to Thee. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading

of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 11, 1955, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1831) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods

from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and it was signed by the Vice President.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF SENATE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the task force of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

#### ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TUESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until next Tuesday at noon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the presentation of petitions and me-